Art History and Visual Studies in Europe

Brill's Studies in Intellectual History

Brill's Studies on Art, Art History, and Intellectual History

Art History and Visual Studies in Europe

Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks

Edited by

Matthew Rampley
Thierry Lenain
Hubert Locher
Andrea Pinotti
Charlotte Schoell-Glass
Kitty Zijlmans

CONTENTS

PART ONE

METHODS, DEBATES AND PARADIGMS

PART TWO

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE DISCIPLINE

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

ARETI ADAMOPOULOU is Assistant Professor in Art History at the University of Ioannina, Greece. She has published widely on twentieth-century Greek art, with a particular emphasis on the post-war period.

JAN BAETENS is Professor of Literary and Cultural Theory at the Institute for Cultural Studies of the University of Leuven. His research interests focus on new media and on the relation between image and narrative. Recent books include studies of Hergé and of the *bande dessinée*, as well as contemporary photography of the Low Countries.

ELKA BAKALOVA is Professor of Byzantine and Medieval Art at the New Bulgarian University (Sofia) and corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. She is the editor of *Problemi na izkoustvoto* (Art Studies) a quarterly journal of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and has published widely on the medieval art of Bulgaria and the Balkans.

WOJCIECH BAŁUS is Professor of Art History at the Jagiellonian University of Cracow. His research interests are centred on nineteenth and twentieth-century painting and architecture. Books include studies of nineteenth-century architecture and public space in Cracow, and nineteenth-century Polish religious painting.

MILENA BARTLOVÁ is Professor of Art History at the Academy of Art in Prague. She is author of numerous books and articles on medieval Bohemian art and architecture, and she has a particular interest in nationalism in the historiography of medieval art.

HANS DAM CHRISTENSEN is Head of Research at the Royal School of Library and Information Sciences, Copenhagen. His research interests are centred on the relation between art history and visual culture, and museology in the Nordic countries.

WILFRIED VAN DAMME is Lecturer in Art History at the University of Leiden. His research deals with African art and world art studies, with a particular focus on anthropology and anthropological aesthetics.

RALPH DEKONINCK is Lecturer in Art History at the Université catholique de Louvain. His research publications focus on image theory, specifically idolatry and Christian theories of the image. Current projects include a study of the relation between image and text in Jesuit literature.

BURCU DOGRAMACI is Professor of Art History at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich. Her specialisms include cultural transfer, artistic exile and migration in twentieth-century art.

VICTOR GINSBURGH is Professor of Economics at the Université Libre de Bruxelles. He has published widely on the economics of the arts, including *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture* (2006, co-authored with David Throsby).

BRIAN GRAHAM is Professor Emeritus of Human Geography at the University of Ulster at Coleraine. He has written widely on heritage, with a particular focus on the intersection of European heritage and national politics.

GONZALO M. BORRÁS GUALIS is Professor of Modern and Contemporary Art History at the University of Zaragoza. An authority on the Islamic art of Spain, he is also author of numerous books on Spanish art historiography, including the first critical dictionary of Spanish art historians.

NATALIE HEINICH is Director of CNRS, the National Centre for Research in Arts and Language, Paris. She has published numerous books on the sociology of art, with a particular emphasis being the sociology of contemporary art.

ERMA HERMENS is Lord Kelvin-Adam Smith Fellow in Technical Art History at the University of Glasgow. Her research interests include technical art history, and especially historical painting techniques, materials and studio practices, with an emphasis on Dutch and Flemish painting of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

LAURA IAMURRI is a researcher at the Università degli Studi di Roma Tre. Her research is focused on patronage, collecting and art criticism in late-nineteenth-century Italy. Publications have included books on Lionello Venturi, Carlo Levi and art and culture in interwar Turin.

DENNIS JANZEN is a PhD student in Art History at the Philipp University of Marburg. He is undertaking research into German board games.

DAN KARLHOLM is Professor of Art History and Theory at Södertörn University College, and is editor of the *Konsthistorisk tidskrift*. Principal research areas include the history of art history, and the relation between visual studies and art history.

KRISTA KODRES is Professor of Art History at the Academy of Art, Tallinn. A member of the editorial board of the new history of Estonian art, her research is concerned with Estonian art of the early modern period, and with the history of the discipline within Estonia.

THIERRY LENAIN is Professor of Art Theory at the Université Libre de Bruxelles. Published works include studies of forgery, monkey painting and the image in Deleuze, Foucault and Lyotard.

HUBERT LOCHER is Professor of the History and Theory of the Image, and Director of the German Art Historical Documentation Centre of the Philipp University, Marburg. Alongside work on the Renaissance, specifically Alberti, Raphael and Ghirlandaio, he has written and edited numerous books on museum and exhibitionary practice, art theory and the historiography of art.

NENAD MAKULJEVIĆ is Professor of Art History at the University of Belgrade. The main topic of his research and publications has been the history of Serbian nineteenth- and twentieth-century art, and the relation between art and nationalism.

FRANÇOIS MAIRESSE is Director of the Musée royal de Mariemont, Belgium and also Lecturer in Museology and New Media at the Jean Moulin University—Lyon III and the University of Liège. His research examines the contemporary place of the museum and the relation between the museum, the market and the state.

MARGA VAN MECHELEN is a Lecturer in Contemporary Art History at the University of Amsterdam. She has published widely on conceptual, performance and installation art since the late seventies and on issues concerning historiography and visual theory in general and visual semiotics and psycho-semiotics in particular.

GIEDRĖ MICKŪNAITĖ is Head of the Department of Art History and Theory at Vilnius Academy of Arts. She is an historian of medieval Lithuanian art and is currently researching constructions of Lithuanian medieval history in the nineteenth century.

STELLA PELŠE is a researcher at the Institute of Art History of the Art Academy of Latvia, Riga. Her research is concerned with nineteenth- and twentieth-century Latvian art, and with Latvian art theory in the first half of the twentieth century.

ANDREA PINOTTI is Professor of Philosophy at the Università degli Studi, Milan. He has written widely on German nineteenth- and twentieth-century aesthetics and its place within the historiography of art, including books on Riegl, Warburg and Walter Benjamin.

RAPHAËL PIRENNE is a Lecturer in Art History and Theory at the Université catholique de Louvain and the Ecole Supérieur des Arts, Brussels. His research interests are focused on postwar art and the theory of spectatorship in art history.

GRISELDA POLLOCK is Director of the Centre for Cultural Analysis, Theory and History at the University of Leeds, where she is Professor of Social and Critical Histories of Art. She is the author of world famous and groundbreaking studies on nineteenth-century artists such as Mary Cassatt, van Gogh, and Millet, in which she has examined the complex relations between femininity, modernity, psychoanalysis and representation.

DOMINIQUE POULOT is Professor in History of Art (History of Cultural Heritage) at the Sorbonne. His research concerns museums and museology in France during the revolutionary period, and the history of concepts of heritage.

MATTHEW RAMPLEY is Professor in the History of Art of the University of Birmingham. He has published widely on aesthetics and the historiography of art, with a particular focus on Nietzsche, Warburg, Riegl and the Vienna School of Art History, and is associate editor of the *Journal of Art Historiography*.

JOËL ROUCLOUX is the Director of the Museum of Louvain-la-Neuve and Professor in Art History at the Université catholique de Louvain. He specialises in the museology of twentieth-century art.

ANTONELLA SBRILLI is Associate Professor in Contemporary Art History at the Sapienza University of Rome. Her research focuses on digital media and their significance for art history and the museum.

PETER SCHNEEMANN is Director of the Department of Modern and Contemporary Art of the Institute of Art History at the University of Basel. He has published widely on contemporary and postwar art, with a particular interest in spectatorship and reception aesthetics.

CHARLOTTE SCHOELL-GLASS is Professor of Art History at the University of Hamburg. A member of the editorial board of *Word and Image*, her research interests focus on the relation between image and text, and she has also published on Aby Warburg, including a critical edition of the Diary of the Warburg Library in Hamburg and a study of Warburg and anti-Semitism.

ANTONIO SOMAINI is Professor in the History of Film and the Visual Arts at the University of Genova. His research areas include the notion of visual culture, the history of film theories of the 1920s and 1930s (with a focus on the problem of montage), and the relationships between cinema and the visual arts, and between cinema and architecture.

CORINA TEACĂ is a researcher at the Georgiu Oprescu Institute of Art History, Bucharest. Her research focuses on Romanian art, collecting in Romania, and Romanian art theory and criticism of the early twentieth century.

KITTY ZIJLMANS is Director of the Leiden University Institute for Cultural Disciplines. Her main areas of research and publication have been contemporary art, the theory and methodologies of art history and world art studies as a new disciplinary paradigm.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book originated from the project of a group of scholars who formed a network broadly titled *Discourses of the Visible: National and International Perspectives*, which was financed by the European Science Foundation. This network was initiated in Edinburgh by Matthew Rampley in 2003. Since then, the current editors Thierry Lenain in Belgium, Hubert Locher and Charlotte Schoell-Glass in Germany, Andrea Pinotti in Italy, Matthew Rampley in the United Kingdom, and Kitty Zijlmans in the Netherlands worked together as organizers of conferences and editors of the present publication.

Coming from different discursive traditions and working in different ways in the areas of visual culture, art history and aesthetics, we tried to create an international forum where scholars could engage in comparative analysis of responses to a range of contemporary issues in art history and visual studies. Accordingly, the project was organized around six workshops, each dedicated to a specific topic. These included: the role of institutions in shaping the scope and development of art-historical discourse; the place and meaning of art within a society focused on the image; the construction of national histories of art; the function of heritage discourses and practices; the scientific and technical image, and, finally, the role of the art-historical canon.[1] This was not meant to be an exhaustive list, and we acknowledged that our choice would be open to debate, for it is always possible to promote alternative visions of what is most pertinent to critical reflection on the state of contemporary art history. However, as a multi-national group of researchers, we aimed to identify themes which we thought would have the widest transnational resonance. It was clear

---

[1] The workshops took place at the Edinburgh College of Art (2004), organized by Matthew Rampley, on 'Art History in National Contexts: Structures and Institutions of Scholarship'; at the University of Milan (2005), organized by Andrea Pinotti and Hubert Locher, on 'Art in the Age of Visual Culture and the Image'; at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (2005), organized by Thierry Lenain, on 'Art History in Ideological Contexts: The Development of National Historiographies'; at the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Study, Wassenaar (2006), organized by Kitty Zijlmans, on 'Reading Images: Art History, Medicine, Astronomy and other Discourses'; at the Slovene National Gallery of Art, Ljubljana (2006), organized by Matthew Rampley on 'Heritage (Ideology, Politics, Culture)'; and at the University of Hamburg's Kunstgeschichtliches Seminar (2006), organized by Charlotte Schoell-Glass and Hubert Locher, on 'The Art Historical Canon and Its Functions'.

to us that other questions might have a greater urgency in specific local situations, but we believed that excessive attention to such issues would effectively disenfranchise many communities of scholars.

Inasmuch as the project aimed to include a large international array of researchers, it was successful. There were participants from twenty-six states, which included locations as diverse as South Korea, Israel, Lithuania, Macedonia, the United States, France, Slovenia and Finland. Early on, we decided not to publish our findings in the customary form of proceedings but to incorporate them in a publication which was to combine questions regarding national and particular forms of art-historical discourses with those that focused on aspects common to all. The collection presented here contains topics that were discussed at the various workshops and authors who originally participated in them, but also contributions especially commissioned for this volume which has been designed on the basis of our previous work and findings and planned independently of the network's workshops by the editors.

Sometimes it was far from easy shaping the individual contributions to form a consistent whole. In addition to the usual problems of the publication of collected essays, our aim to publish both a systematic and a geographic survey of art history and visual studies in Europe was undertaken for the first time and therefore had to be explained and negotiated more thoroughly than we had expected. Again, national discursive traditions needed to be acknowledged and the going beyond borders proved challenging for all concerned. Discussions as well as editorial interventions were more time-consuming than we initially expected. Not the least of our tasks was the linguistic unifying of so many texts written in English, French or German by authors who were not native speakers of English. The differences however could not be levelled by translation: they also influenced the way the authors understood and responded to questions that arose from both the systematic and the geographical accounts that we had asked for. As editors, we did not wish to smooth over these different viewpoints, obviously influenced by the national cultures of scholarship from within which they were written. The wealth of different European discourses of the visible, it seemed to us, could be perceived all the better for them.

The contribution of numerous individuals and organizations to the completion of this volume is gratefully acknowledged. First, we thank the European Science Foundation for funding the original network and subsequently providing financial support for the volume. Thanks are due in

Thierry Lenain, Brussels
Hubert Locher, Marburg
Andrea Pinotti, Milan
Charlotte Schoell-Glass, Hamburg
Matthew Rampley, Birmingham
Kitty Zijlmans, Leiden

INTRODUCTION

Matthew Rampley

This book, and the project out of which it grew, was initially planned as a critical study of the contemporary practices of art history and visual studies. Funded by the European Science Foundation, particular emphasis was to be given to Europe as a geographical frame. From one perspective, the idea of a specifically *European* set of practices and ideas can be seen as a curious and outmoded approach, for art history and visual studies have long operated as sites of transnational intellectual exchange. There have been numerous umbrella organizations facilitating their growth as international enterprises; as early as 1873 the first international conference in art history was staged in Vienna, and while it was dominated by German and Austrian scholars, there were participants from Moscow, Florence, Helsinki, Madrid and Zurich. CIHA, the international committee for art history has since become a significant body, and its conferences major international events. In addition to CIHA one might also mention ICOMOS, the international organization for the preservation of cultural heritage, which likewise addresses the critical evaluation and analysis of art and architecture on an international level. The work of such bodies has been strengthened by governmental initiatives, which have increasingly sought to promote the sense of a shared heritage and culture across political borders.[1] The spread of digital media of communication over the past twenty years has only enhanced and accelerated the process of international collaboration and exchange of ideas, and many of the contributions to the book, such as the meaning of artistic heritage, the value of 'style' as an historiographic concept, the challenge of contemporary art, or the impact of globalism, only strengthen this impression.

Yet, against expectation perhaps, the research project *Discourses of the Visible* threw up a competing image of the landscape of scholarship, in which such border crossings have to contend with the continuing dominance of the national paradigm and with the fact that most scholarship

---

[1] See, for example, the Council of Europe-sponsored publication edited by Raymond Weber, *Forward Planning: The Function of Cultural Heritage in a Changing Europe* (Strasbourg, 2005).

on the history of architecture, art and visual culture continues to be conducted within the framework of the nation state. This observation, which will be elaborated on shortly, led to the conclusion that when producing a publication that would distil many of the issues explored within the project, it was vital to address this phenomenon in greater depth.

Hence, this volume is comprised of two parts; the first consists of analyses of a wide array of critical issues framing the present-day practice and understanding of art history and the study of the image. It has intentionally avoided approaching this in the form of a critical survey of methods; there is already a surfeit of such publications that present a familiar list of art-historical methods and approaches.[2] Rather, it considers the role of a range of operational concepts, contexts and bodies of knowledge in the current practice of art history and visual studies. While some contributions examine debates and ideas that have arisen within specific socio-political contexts—the differing inflections of image theory in anglophone, German-language and francophone scholarship provide a clear example—many others are less geographically specific and bear testimony to the transnational exchange of ideas within Europe and beyond, a prominent feature being the influential role played by scholars based in North American institutions.

In contrast, the second part addresses the specific national political, ideological, social and cultural frames within which art history emerged across a large number of European states, and which have underpinned the continued existence of specific traditions of art-historical knowledge that are nationally determined. This part sought to include accounts both of the major centres of art-historical scholarship—Britain, Germany, France, Italy—as well as 'peripheral' zones such as the Baltic States, the Czech and Slovak Republics, Serbia or Poland, which, if only for reasons of linguistic ignorance on the part of art historians elsewhere, have maintained a frequently isolated presence on the landscape of art history in Europe.

---

[2] See, for example, Eric Fernie, ed., *Art History and its Methods: A Critical Anthology* (London, 1995); Michael Hatt and Charlotte Klonk, *Art History. A Critical Introduction to Its Methods* (Manchester, 2006); Hans Belting, Heinrich Dilly, Wolfgang Kemp, Willibald Sauerländer, and Martin Warnke, eds., *Kunstgeschichte. Eine Einführung* (Berlin, 1993); Jacques Thuillier, *Théorie générale de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 2003); Gonzalo M Borrás Gualis, *Cómo y qué investigar en historia del arte* (Barcelona, 2001); Gianni Sciolla, *Studiare l'arte. Metodo, analisi e interpretazione delle opere e degli artisti* (Turin, 2006).

Conceptual Frameworks

In order to think through the place of the national paradigm within the map of art history it is helpful, perhaps, to have recourse to a number of different conceptual models, starting with the work of Thomas Kuhn. As James Elkins has suggested, Kuhn's distinction between 'normal' science and the innovative inquiry that results in shifts of epistemological paradigm, can also be applied to understanding art-historical practice.[3] For Elkins 'normal' art history consists of practices such as 'iconography, social history, style analysis, archaeological reporting [and] archival documentation', which is to be contrasted with 'twilight genres' such as the history of art history, highly theorized reflection, or reception history. Elkins's concern is primarily with methodological issues, but one can map the difference between 'normal' and 'heterodox' art history onto the question of the national framing of the discipline. As many of the contributors to this volume indicate, much, if not most 'normal' everyday art-historical research continues to be conducted within the paradigm of the modern nation state and national art.

This norm was established in the nineteenth century; an early product was the development of the genre of 'Art Topography', the systematic documentation of artistic and architectural monuments within the boundaries of the national state. As contributors to this volume indicate, a key phase in the evolution of art history across Europe in states, from Spain, Romania, and Poland to France and Italy, was the production of inventories of artworks and the identification of the national artistic heritage. The construction of the history of the national art was seen as a duty and moral imperative by many art historians, and is still a work in progress. Hence, the reputation of the putative 'father' of modern Italian art history, Adolfo Venturi, for example, rests on his work as the author of the massive *History of Italian Art* (*Storia dell'arte italiana*), and the greater part of Italian art-historical writing is still concerned almost exclusively with Italian art.[4] Similar practices can be observed elsewhere; as Ralph Dekoninck and Joël Roucloux suggest, a dominant concern of French art historians in recent decades has been a recognition of their own isolation from innovations taking place elsewhere, coupled with an anxiety to 'legitimate' the

---

[3] James Elkins, *Our Beautiful, Dry and Distant Texts. Art History as Writing* (London, 2000) 11 ff. See Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL, 1964).
[4] Adolfo Venturi, *Storia dell'Arte Italiana* (Milan, 1901–1940).

post-war French avant-garde in the face of its marginalization by American modernism.[5] It is notable, too, that many of the most internationally known francophone writers on art, such as Georges Didi-Huberman, Louis Marin or Thierry de Duve, stand outside the mainstream of art history in their own countries.

There are, of course, exceptions to this pattern; while some of the most notorious nationalist art historians, such as Wilhelm Pinder, Dagobert Frey or Georg Dehio were Germans and Austrians, a characteristic feature of the discipline in Germany and Austria was its decisive contribution to the study of the wider field of European art, beginning with Winckelmann's history of classical art.[6] Despite such exceptions, and one might add Britain in this context, such a characterization nevertheless captures the broad contours of art-historical practice across Europe, in spite of the fact that world histories of art have also been a central feature of the discipline, from Franz Kugler's *Handbook of Art History* (*Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*) of 1842, to more recent enterprises attempting to promote an anti-Eurocentric globalist outlook.[7] It is important nevertheless to be careful when applying such a notion of 'normal' art history, for it implies an evaluative hierarchy that masks the fact that much art-historical writing within the national paradigm can be highly innovative while, conversely, a significant proportion of internationally influential scholarship can be, in methodological terms, often orthodox and content to remain firmly within existing disciplinary norms.

An alternative approach to the question might also be attempted by drawing on Jan Białostocki's notion of the dual economy of art. Discussing Mannerism in Poland, Białostocki suggested that one should distinguish between art and architecture that was embedded in the international circuit of European art, sustained by the patronage of successive Polish monarchs and nobles who exploited the seemingly limitless supply of Italian

---

[5] See Ralph Dekoninck and Joël Roucloux, 'Art History in France. A Conflict of Traditions' (315–333) in this volume.

[6] Nationalism and art history in Germany and Austria is most often discussed in relation to the Nazi period. See Nikola Doll, Christian Fuhrmeister, and Michael H. Sprenger, eds., *Kunstgeschichte im Nationalsozialismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte einer Wissenschaft zwischen 1930 und 1950* (Weimar, 2005); see Charlotte Schoell-Glass, 'Art History in German-speaking Countries: Germany, Austria and Switzerland' (335–353 in this volume).

[7] Franz Kugler, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1842); John Onians, ed., *Atlas of World Art* (London, 2004); David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism* (London, 2003); Irenäus Eibl-Eibesfeldt and Christa Sütterlin, *Weltsprache Kunst: Zur Natur- und Kunstgeschichte bildlicher Kommunikation* (Vienna, 2007).

artists and architects, and the traditions of vernacular art that operated on a very different cycle.[8] The major architectural monuments of cities such as Cracow, Gdansk or Vilnius (as part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth), attested to the impact of this international art. In contrast, vernacular forms were produced in response to local or regional impulses, often characterized by their dependence on locally available materials.

Białostocki was also, of course, pointing to the fact that the 'nationality' of artists was, until the nineteenth century, usually a matter of little concern, but his notion of a multi-layered artistic production can be employed to describe the economy of art-historical scholarship. For, in spite of the massive growth of international collaboration and exchange, the national paradigm frequently remains dominant. An insight into this can be gleaned from consideration of the landscape of art-historical journals. On the one hand, many journals, such as *Art History*, *Artibus et Historiae*, the *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, the *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift* or *Revue de l'art* have an international reach, addressing a wide range of topics written by an international array of art historians. Yet these are far outnumbered by journals such as *Umění*, the *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire de l'Art*, *Paragone*, *Oud-Holland*, *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi* or *Mākslas*, which are resolutely tied to the discussion of national art.[9]

Given that art history was a key institution in the formation of modern European nation states in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, this is hardly surprising; the discipline also emerged in response to the requirements of different audiences, from amateur local enthusiasts to regional and national governments, and also international networks of scholars and supranational organizations. However, despite the substantial quantity of research on the history of the discipline in its wider political and

---

[8] See Jan Białostocki, 'Mannerism and Vernacular in Polish Art', in *Walter Friedlaender zum 90. Geburtstag. Eine Festgabe seiner europäischen Schüler, Freunde und Verehrer*, ed. Georg Kauffmann and Willibald Sauerländer (Berlin, 1967) 69–74.

[9] *Umění* is the major Czech journal of art history and has been published continuously since 1918, although with an interruption between 1946 and 1953; the *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire de l'Art* was first published in 1964 by the Georges Oprescu Institute of Art History, Bucharest. *Paragone*, the journal founded by Roberto Longhi in 1950, is published in Florence; established as a journal of visual and verbal inquiry, its focus remains primarily Italian, although the 2009 issue included an article on Vincent Price and the French actress Françoise Dorléac. *Oud-Holland*, founded in 1883 and published in The Hague, retains its focus on pre-nineteenth-century Dutch art. *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi* (Studies in Art History and Theory) is the major journal of art history in Estonia and has been published since 1991. *Mākslas* has been published by the Latvian Institute of Art History in Riga since 2001.

social context, in which the role of the university and the museum as state institutions has been foregrounded, this still remains a little explored aspect of contemporary art history.[10] The historiographic focus has thus been largely on those writers whose work, exceptionally, achieved an international prominence, in many cases because they focused on topics of international interest and also because they were writing in the major international languages of scholarship.

The dominance of the national paradigm has cast a long shadow over present-day practices; a striking illustration of this can be seen in the contours of current-day visual studies and image theory. Referred to in terms of the 'iconic turn', visual studies emerged in France, Britain (and the United States) and Germany in the 1990s as a powerful challenge to many assumptions sustaining art-historical discourse. While some commonalities are clearly discernible in this trend, with the work of certain writers, such as Hans Belting, Régis Debray, W.J.T. Mitchell or Nicholas Mirzoeff, being widely translated and having a major international impact, there are also distinctive discursive trajectories that map onto national discursive communities. Thus, Anglo-American visual studies, emerging out of cultural studies, in which a concern with the politics of visual representation and popular culture has been uppermost, has a quite different centre of gravity from 'Bildwissenschaft', the term used to describe the wide range of image theories prominent in Germany. The latter, drawing on discourses from aesthetics, communication theory, anthropology and theories of social memory, has in general kept aloof from questions of political engagement.[11] Moreover, while some exponents of 'Bildwissenschaft' have emphasized its links to art history, visual studies has, in contrast, aggressively distanced itself from the historical analysis of the image. Not only has its primary object been the function of visual representation within the postmodern society of the mass image, in addition, authors such as Irit Rogoff have argued that visual studies is defined by its very opposition to any historical, diachronic paradigm.[12]

---

[10] See, for example, Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory and Politics* (London, 1995); Hubert Locher, 'Die Kunst der Nation', in Locher, *Kunstgeschichte als historische Theorie der Kunst* (Munich, 2nd edn., 2010); Donald Preziosi, *Brain of the Earth's Body: Art, Museums and the Phantasms of Modernity* (Minneapolis, MN, 2003).

[11] Prominent authors have included, Gottfried Böhm, Hans Belting, Klaus Sachs-Hombach and Horst Bredekamp. See Matthew Rampley, 'Bildwissenschaft: Theories of the Image in German-Language Scholarship' (119–134 in this volume).

[12] Rogoff's critique emphasizes the difference not only between visual studies and art history, but also its opposition to the history of film, photography or other mass media. See Irit Rogoff, *Terra Infirma: Geography's Visual Culture* (London, 2000).

Although writers based in France such as Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Jacques Rancière or Julia Kristeva have had a global impact on thinking about the image, it is nevertheless also possible, as Ralph Dekoninck argues in this volume, to identify a distinctive body of thought in France, a historical poetics of the image, which differs from Anglo-American visual studies and German 'Bildwissenschaft', and which owes its origins to specific institutional and discursive contexts in France. In its concern with articulating the problematics of the hermeneutics of the historical artwork, it has greater affinities to German *Bildwissenschaft*, but in its adoption of a modernist visual poetics (central to which is a mobilization of Freudian psychoanalysis) it also displays a distinctive intellectual trajectory.

In preparing this volume we therefore felt it was necessary not simply to acknowledge the extent to which discourses on art and the visual image are still nationally framed. The persistence of this phenomenon has hardly been analysed; where it has been examined, it has been dismissed in terms of a recidivist lapse into nationalism, recalling the nationalist historiographies of the earlier part of the twentieth century.[13] The aim of this project is not, however, to rehabilitate the national; as the more detailed discussion of national art and national art histories in this book indicates, the idea of a national art is rent with contradictions which globalized networks of communication and exchange render all the more visible. What it does aim for, however, is recognition of the multiple narratives that should comprise the historical reflection on the discipline.

Beyond the Austro-German Tradition

Analysis of the practice of art history (and its history) has in many ways relied on a partial vision, distorted by the dominance of the tradition of Austrian and German writing. With few exceptions, this has ensured that much attention has been given to the writings of thinkers working within that tradition, from Alois Riegl and Max Dvořák to Aby Warburg, Erwin Panofsky, and Ernst Gombrich.[14] Moreover, the critique of the intellectual

---

[13] One exception is Michael Zimmermann, ed., *The Art Historian: National Traditions and Institutional Practices* (London and New Haven, CT, 2003) although it is rather limited in scope.

[14] As might be expected, this has been most prominent in Germany. See, for example, Heinrich Dilly, ed., *Altmeister moderner Kunstgeschichte: Kunstgeschichte zur Einführung* (Berlin, 1999); Regine Prange, *Die Geburt der Kunstgeschichte: Philosophische Ästhetik und empirische Wissenschaft* (Cologne, 2004); Ulrich Pfisterer, ed., *Klassiker der Kunstgeschichte. 1: Von Winckelmann bis Warburg* (Munich, 2007) and *2: Von Panofsky bis Greenberg*

and ideological presuppositions of humanist art history that has emerged in the past thirty or so years, first in the name of a 'radical' or 'new' art history, subsequently in the guise of 'visual studies', has essentially been a critique of this Austro-German tradition. Thus Georges Didi-Huberman's attempt to reframe art history, for example, consists of an extended meditation on Panofsky, to whom he counterpoises Warburg as the model of an alternative iconographic practice.[15] Likewise, Norman Bryson's espousal of a semiological art history in the 1980s was driven by the critique of Gombrich (as well as a deep engagement with the thought of Louis Althusser and Jean-François Lyotard).[16] The sense of the importance of this tradition has been particularly heightened given the impact of the large-scale migration of German and Austrian art historians to the United States from 1933 onwards.[17] However, as the contributions to this volume suggest, the field of art history has always been much more dispersed and complex, even if Austro-German discourses and practices have played an undeniably leading and significant role.

We therefore saw the need to map the different histories of the discipline across various nation states; in the post-1989 era of re-emerging states (the 'Baltic' states are a case in point), there has been visible a desire to emphasize their singularity, their own, individual cultural identity. This has given an enormous incentive both to the writing of a local (i.e. national) art history (which has, in many cases, involved a revisiting of native intellectual traditions) and also to the foundation of museums of art.

(Munich, 2008). In anglophone scholarship an important role was played by Michael Podro's *The Critical Historians of Art* (London and New Haven, CT, 1982) and Michael Ann Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* (Princeton, NJ, 1985), both viewing the attempts to deal with the philosophical legacy of Kant as forming the conceptual backbone of the discipline. See, too, Edouard Pommier, *Histoire et théories de l'art: De Winckelmann à Panofsky* (Paris, 1994). A more even-handed approach is evident in Germain Bazin, *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art de Vasari à nos jours* (Paris, 1986), Udo Kultermann, *Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte: Der Weg einer Wissenschaft* (Berlin, 1966) and Gianni Sciolla, *La critica d'arte del Novecento* (Turin, 1995) although these mostly provide a brief positivistic documentation rather than any clear critical interpretation.

[15] Georges Didi-Huberman, *Devant le temps: Histoire de l'art et anachronisme des images* (Paris, 2000) and *L'image survivante. Histoire de l'art et temps des fantômes selon Aby Warburg* (Paris, 2002).

[16] Norman Bryson, *Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze* (London, 1983).

[17] This emphasis is clearly visible, for example, in the on-line *Dictionary of Art Historians*, based in the United States, in which a significant majority of entries are devoted to Austrian, German, British and American art historians.

In one sense, therefore, this book comprises an attempt to open up the field of historiographic reflection; it attempts to recognize the crucial work of authors who are barely known outside of their original home territories. Such ignorance is partly a function of linguistic (in)competence. Anyone writing in a language beyond the major European international languages of art history (English, French, German) encounters incomprehension, and in this regard the recent launch of the journal *Art in Translation* represents an overdue and valuable step towards addressing this situation, albeit a one-way process of translation into English. In addition, however, this phenomenon mirrors the more generally skewed landscape of historiographic reflection and its alignment with wider geopolitical factors.[18]

This is the first attempt to undertake such a broad critical overview of the state of art history across Europe, but this is not at the expense of the recognition of the wider contexts in which it is situated. North America, in particular, the United States, has come to exert a dominant influence on European art history, on a number of levels. The emigration during the 1930s of scholars such as Panofsky, Edgar Wind, Richard Krautheimer, Ernst Kris, or Richard Ettinghausen to the United States was an intellectual transfer that reflected the wider re-distribution and accumulation of cultural, intellectual and political capital during the Second World War and the post-war period.[19] In many respects this paralleled the transfer of the avant-garde and the art market from Paris to New York, initially celebrated in triumphalist vein by American commentators.[20] This process has accelerated over the past decades; institutions such as the Getty Research Institute, the Clark Art Institute, the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, or the American Academy in Rome, coupled with well-endowed research universities such as Yale, Harvard or Princeton, have exercised a major influence on the shape of art-historical research.

---

[18] Arguably the work of even Italian art historians is little known beyond Italy and specialists in Italian art history. The recently established journal *Art in Translation*, funded by the Getty and published by Berg since 2009, is an effort to address the broader deficit through translation of texts from a wide range of languages.

[19] See Karen Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft. Deutschsprachige Kunstgeschichte im amerikanischen Exil* (Berlin, 1999).

[20] See, for example, Irving Sandler, *The Triumph of American Painting. A History of Abstract Expressionism* (New York and San Francisco, 1976); Serge Guilbaut, *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art. Abstract Expressionism, Freedom and the Cold War* (Chicago, IL, 1983).

This dominance has been secured not only through the funding of large-scale research projects and publications by scholars in the United States, but also through well-intentioned projects of academic exchange, which have often been closer to a one-sided cultural transfer than to a genuinely mutual sharing of concerns. The Summer Institutes held at the University of Rochester in the late 1990s and funded by the Getty Research Institute, exemplified this process very clearly. Laying particular stress on the involvement of scholars from Central and Eastern Europe (who constituted some two thirds of the participants), they were in effect exercises in the promotion of the then 'new' art history and visual studies. Speakers such as Kaja Silverman, Norman Bryson, Keith Moxey and Stephen Melville addressed contemporary issues in aesthetics, visual theory and art history, as if assisting colleagues from across the former Iron Curtain overcome a theoretical and methodological 'deficit' accrued during the decades of post-war Communist-imposed academic semi-isolation.[21] The United States has also been a crucial mediator of intra-European academic exchanges; awareness amongst British scholars of much significant contemporary and historical scholarship in continental Europe has often been dependent on translations sponsored by research institutions such as the Getty, or the willingness of American presses to publish translations into English, rather than on direct first-hand experience.[22]

Europe in/and the World

We were aware that the focus on Europe might leave the project open to the criticism of parochialism at a time when increasing attention is being paid to the practice of art history as a global set of discourses. Many have highlighted the counter-discourses that have challenged the assumed

---

[21] One striking instance of the impact of the Institutes is Margaret Dikovitskaya's *Visual Culture: The Study of the Visual after the Cultural Turn* (Cambridge, MA, 2006). A paean to the advent of 'new' art history and visual studies, the book includes extensive interviews with, for example, Nicholas Mirzoeff, William J.T. Mitchell, Martin Jay, and Douglas Crimp, who were also leading figures at the Summer Institute.

[22] The Getty Research Institute and Zone Press have played a vital role in this regard. The *Texts and Documents* series has been vital in making available texts by Gottfried Semper, Siegfried Giedion, Alois Riegl, Johann Joachim Winckelmann, Karel Teige, Aby Warburg or Robert Vischer, for example, to anglophone audiences. Zone has published translations of works by Henri Focillon, Erwin Panofsky, Georges Bataille, Philippe-Alain Michaud on Aby Warburg, Alois Riegl and other authors of the Vienna School.

hegemony of Euro-American art-historical scholarship.[23] As Tapati Guha-Thakurta has demonstrated, for example, colonial India produced a significant body of art-historical writing, starting with the work of Ram Raz (1790–1830) and Rajendralal Mitra (1823/4–1891), which contested British narratives of Indian visual culture and its place within the universal hierarchy of 'civilizations.'[24] The scope and development of 'other' art histories has become a major theme that has led not merely to a global expansion of art history but to a disruption of its claim to be a unitary field.[25] As James Elkins has suggested, however, the European model of art history is not easily evaded; for a discourse to be recognizably *art-historical* it requires conformity to a recognized set of protocols that can trace their origins to the discipline in Europe.[26] If a practice diverges noticeably from these, and Elkins cites examples from early Persia and India—to which could be added the enormous corpus of pre-modern writing in China on the arts—its character as *art history* becomes difficult to recognize, and it functions more as theology, aesthetic meditation or genealogical chronicle. Conversely, in an echo of the wider dilemmas of the post-colonial critic, the many authors who have contributed to the globalizing of art history, such as Olu Oguibe, Okwui Enwezor, Gilane Tawadros, Kobena Mercer, Partha Mitter or Geeta Kapur, have done so within the clear parameters of European and American art history and cultural criticism.

In *Provincializing Europe* Dipesh Chakrabarty stressed the need to decentre Europe and the historicist construction of modernity that placed

---

[23] James Elkins, ed., *Is Art History Global?* (London, 2006).

[24] Tapati Guha-Thakurta, *Monuments, Objects, Histories: Institutions of Art in Colonial and Postcolonial India* (New Delhi, 2004) and Guha-Thakurta, *The Making of a New 'Indian' Art* (Cambridge, MA, 1992). Key nineteenth-century texts were: Ram Raz, *Essay on the Architecture of the Hindus* (London, 1834), and Rajendralal Mitra, *The Antiquities of Orissa* (Calcutta, 1875). Shyama Charan Srimani, *Suksha Shilper Utpatti o Arya Jatir Shilpa Chaturi* (Fine Arts of India, With a Short Sketch of the Origins of Art) (Calcutta, 1874) was the first work of art history in Bengali, and gave rise to a significant body of art criticism in Bengali connected to the anti-colonial independence movement.

[25] See, for example, Gerardo Mosquera, ed., *Beyond the Fantastic: Contemporary Art Criticism from Latin America* (London, 1995); Vishakha N. Desai, ed., *Asian Art History in the Twenty-First Century* (New Haven, CT, 2007); John Onians, ed., *Compression vs. Expression: Containing the World's Art* (New Haven, CT, 2007). See too the series edited by Kobena Mercer, *Annotating Art's Histories* (London, 2004–7), which addresses twentieth-century art on a global, post-colonial basis.

[26] James Elkins, *Stories of Art* (London, 2003). See, too, Elkins, 'Writing about Modernist Painting outside Western Europe and North America', in Onians, ed., *Compression vs. Expression*, 188–214.

it as the privileged subject of all histories.[27] The focus of this volume on European art history does not imply granting Europe a particular privilege in this sense; indeed, the attention to the multiple narratives of art-historical practice, its institutional and political contexts, aims to produce an image of Europe itself as polycentric and dispersed. At the same time, as the contributions to this volume suggest, consideration of the parallel histories of the emergence, growth and present state of the discipline throw up numerous parallels and commonalities. It is these that afford a coherence which a global analysis of art history would never be able to attain.

Some Words on Method

It is also important to pass a few comments on our approach, since the second part of the volume contains a series of contributions outlining art-historical practices in a range of European states. We did not seek encyclopaedic comprehensiveness, and thus there are omissions, such as Portugal, Hungary or Russia, and while the underlying premise was the role of the process of state formation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as a crucial frame governing art history, our contributors interpreted the task of accounting for their own local situation in different ways. Most chose to provide a historical genealogy of the present, but otherwise there was considerable variation in their approach to the text. For some the development of art history could be seen in terms of successive generations, in which relations between students and teachers, a paternalistic professional tradition, provided the impetus for the development of the discipline. Others saw art history as directly and intimately involved in wider historical and ideological contexts, whether it was the impact of Nazism, the founding of political states (from Ottoman Turkey after the First World War to the Baltic countries in 1991).

A major issue presented by the contributions to the second part of the volume was the question of the order of presentation. In keeping with the general tenor of this book, we were concerned to avoid traditional hierarchies, and beginning with Italy, German-speaking countries, France or Britain would have provided structural support to such inequalities. On the other hand, alternative systems of ordering would have created

---

[27] Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, NJ, 2000).

other difficulties. A geographical division of Europe would have produced strange anomalies, suggesting that we held to the notion of regional unities where none existed. 'Northern' Europe, for example, would have included the Baltic States and the Nordic states, yet in many respects the former have more in common with Poland and other post-Soviet states, while the Nordic states have the strongest affinities to Germany and Britain. Britain, while geographically closest to Belgium, France and the Netherlands, nevertheless owes the greatest intellectual debt to Germany and Austria, due to the influx of art historians to Britain in the 1930s.

We therefore opted to present the contributions in alphabetical order. Aware that this is a somewhat arbitrary decision, we were nevertheless conscious of the fact that other orderings would raise more fundamental questions and thus saw this as the least problematic option.

PART ONE

METHODS, DEBATES AND PARADIGMS

ART HISTORY, AESTHETICS AND ART CRITICISM

Antonio Somaini

The rise of visual studies during the last decade has triggered a lively debate among the various disciplines that direct their attention towards the study of images and of visual experience, most particularly within anglophone scholarship. The relationship between this new research field and pre-existing disciplines such as art history, aesthetics, and art criticism has been the object of considerable discussion concerning the analogies and differences that exist among such different practices regarding the objects of study, the methods to adopt, and their aims. Indeed, in North America, visual studies resulted in many cases in a restructuring of academic programs which has, in turn, triggered a need to redefine the borders between neighbouring, often overlapping disciplines.[1]

Hovering in the background of this debate is a tradition within which the relationships between art history, aesthetics and art criticism have often been discussed in the framework of binary oppositions such as history *vs.* theory, past *vs.* present, description *vs.* evaluation, individual *vs.* general.

The relationship between *art history* and *aesthetics*, for example, has often been described in terms of a distinction between an *historical* and an *a-historical* approach to images and to visual arts. That is, between a position which considers images and artworks as specific social and historical constructs, and another that instead considers them as examples from which to derive general theoretical conclusions concerning the aesthetic experience of a subject conceived in a-historical terms.

The relationship between *art criticism* and *art history*, on the other hand, has often been presented as the difference between a writing practice whose main aim is the *evaluation* of current artistic production, and

---

[1] Among the many publications dedicated in recent years to the relationships among art history, aesthetics, art criticism and visual studies, see for example Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey, eds., *Art History, Aesthetics, Visual Studies* (London and New Haven, CT, 2002); Mark Cheetham, Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey, 'Visual Studies, Historiography, and Aesthetics', *Journal of Visual Culture* 4.1 (2005) 75–90; Margaret Dikovitskaya, *Visual Culture: The Study of the Visual after the Cultural Turn* (Cambridge, MA, 2005); James Elkins, ed., *Art History Versus Aesthetics* (New York and London, 2006); James Elkins and Michael Newman, eds., *The State of Art Criticism* (New York and London, 2008).

a discipline which, although based on a series of implicit aesthetic and normative judgements, usually tends to favour *description* and *interpretation* over evaluation.

Finally, the relationship between *art criticism* and *aesthetics* has often been constructed as the difference between the engaged practice of criticism dealing with *individual* artworks, and the study of the *general* conditions of possibility for the exercise of aesthetic judgement itself.

From time to time, such binary oppositions, here presented in an admittedly schematic way, have been emphasized or downplayed; the result has been the generation of diverse views on the relationship between these disciplines, as well as a recurrent need to overcome such distinctions in order to create an all-encompassing approach capable of combining art history, aesthetics, and art criticism. Such was the project of the *Kunstwissenschaft* imagined by Max Dessoir at the beginning of the twentieth century, and in many ways contemporary visual studies may be considered as striving again towards such a synthesis, with a significant shift from the domain of 'art' to the wider domain of the 'visual'. In an essay dedicated to the analysis of the status of visual culture studies, W.J.T. Mitchell seemed to partake of this view when he suggests that the new research field could be regarded as resulting from a close integration between art history and aesthetics 'in their most expansive manifestations.' As Mitchell states:

> Aesthetics is the theoretical branch of the study of art. It raises fundamental questions about the nature of art, artistic value, and artistic perception within the general field of perceptual experience. Art history is the historical study of artists, artistic practices, styles, movements and institutions. Together, then, art history and aesthetics provide a completeness: they 'cover' any conceivable question one might have about the visual arts. And if one conceives them in their most expansive manifestations, art history as a general iconology or hermeneutics of visual images, aesthetics as the study of sensation and perception, then it seems clear that they already take care of any issues that a 'visual studies' might want to raise. The theory of visual experience would be dealt with in aesthetics; the history of images and visual forms would be dealt with in art history.[2]

---

[2] William J.T. Mitchell, 'Showing Seeing: A Critique of Visual Culture', in Mitchell, *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images* (Chicago, IL, 2005) 338. This position is shared by James Elkins, who in his essay 'Why Don't Art Historians Attend Aesthetics Conferences?' writes: 'I can't imagine two disciplines that are better suited to one another, more securely historically intertwined, than art history and aesthetics. The two share common traditions regarding the ways that artworks create meaning, and they even share notions of rebellion against some of those meanings' (*Art History Versus Aesthetics*, 41).

The ongoing, lively discussion about the troubled relationships and productive tensions between art history, aesthetics, art criticism, and visual studies shows us that the ideal integration suggested by Mitchell in the passage quoted above has not taken place, and that the status of such research fields in relation to one another is still an open, unsettled issue. The following pages will discuss this issue from one of the many perspectives that might be adopted to tackle such a wide topic. This chapter centres on the problem of *value*, and the question I address is the extent to which the development of these four research fields over the last three decades has exhibited some form of *convergence* among their ways of handling the question of value and value judgements.[3] My argument is that they have indeed found common ground in adopting what we might call a *historicist*, *social-constructionist*, and *relativist* approach. From this perspective, the value of images and artworks is considered to be socially and historically relative, contextually specific, discursively constituted through a series of processes of negotiation, which involve a number of subjects and institutions. Within such a framework, rather than emphasizing their differences in terms of a historicist in contrast to a non-historicist or a descriptive against an evaluative approach, art history, aesthetics, art criticism, and visual studies seem rather to be converging on the common goal of analysing the factors, the subjects, and the institutions involved in the production of different kinds of value—aesthetic, artistic, cultural, economic—understood as always intertwined with each other. The remainder of this chapter will highlight the presence of such an approach to the idea of value across a number of influential trends in all the four research fields considered.

In the domain of *aesthetics*, the so-called *institutional theories of art*, elaborated as early as the 1960s, 70s and 80s by authors such as Arthur Danto, George Dickie and Howard S. Becker answered the traditional questions that had been raised by aesthetics concerning the problem of value—is there a distinctive kind of value that all and only works of art aspire to possess? What kinds of properties can contribute to the value of a work of art? Can the evaluation of works of art be guided by rules

---

[3] For a general introduction to the question of value and value judgements in art history and aesthetics, see Joseph Leo Koerner and Lisbet Rausing, 'Value', in *Critical Terms for Art History,* ed. Robert Nelson and Richard Shiff (Chicago, 2003) 419–34. Alan Goldman, 'Evaluating Art', in *The Blackwell Guide to Aesthetics*, ed. Peter Kivy (Oxford, 2004) 93–108; George Dickie, *Evaluating Art* (Philadelphia, 1988); Malcolm Budd, *Values of Art: Pictures, Poetry, and Music* (Harmondsworth, 1995).

or principles? Is artistic value absolute or relative?—by investigating the social and institutional factors that contribute to the evaluation of certain objects as 'art.'[4]

In the field of *art criticism*, in a way that is somewhat similar to the institutional theories of art, the *institutional critique* developed by authors such as Benjamin Buchloh in close connection with the work of conceptual artists such as Marcel Broodthaers, Hans Haacke, Daniel Buren, and Andrea Fraser, rejected the traditional equivalence of criticism and evaluative judgement in favour of an analysis of the socio-institutional conditions which lie at the basis of the evaluation of artworks.[5]

Recent *art history* acknowledges the role that implicit value and normative judgements have played in its own history[6] and studies the social and institutional factors that have conditioned the history of taste and of the reception of images, separating the question of artistic value from that of historical significance.[7]

Visual studies, finally, rejects the preliminary distinction between the 'artistic' and the 'non-artistic' which has traditionally characterized art history, and lists among its objectives that of taking into consideration the entire domain of images and the entire spectrum of all the forms of visual experience, in order to study the ways in which values, beliefs, ideas, and identities are visually negotiated, constituted, shared, and transmitted. As Mieke Bal has stated, 'visual culture studies is not defined by its choice of

---

[4] On the institutional theories of art see Arthur Danto, 'The Artworld', *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964) 571–84; George Dickie, 'Defining Art', *American Philosophical Quarterly* 6.3 (1969) 253–6; Dickie, *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis* (Ithaca, NY, 1974); Dickie, *The Art Circle: A Theory of Art* (Berkeley, CA, 1985); Howard Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley, CA, 1982); Monroe C. Beardsley, 'Is Art Essentially Institutional?' in *Culture and Art,* ed. Lars Aagaard-Mogensen (Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1976) 194–209. For a social deconstruction of the idea of taste, see Pierre Bourdieu, *De la distinction. Critique sociale du jugement* (Paris, 1979) (English translation: *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, transl. by Richard Nice (London, 1986)).

[5] On institutional critique see Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, 'Conceptual Art 1962–1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions', *October* 55 (1990) 105–43; Julia Bryan-Wilson, 'A Curriculum of Institutional Critique', in *New Institutionalism,* ed. Jonas Ekeberg (Oslo, 2003) 89–109; Andrea Fraser, 'From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique', *Artforum* 44.1 (2005) 278–83; John C. Welchman, ed., *Institutional Critique and After* (Zürich, 2006).

[6] As Thierry De Duve writes in his contribution to the debate in Elkins, *Art History Versus Aesthetics*, 60, 'art history is first of all constituted by the evidential record of previous aesthetic judgement'.

[7] See, for example, David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago, IL, 1991); Dario Gamboni, *The Destruction of Art: Iconoclasm and Vandalism Since the French Revolution* (London, 1997).

objects, but by the focus on *practices of looking*. It is the possibility of per-forming acts of seeing, not the materiality of the object seen, that decides whether an artefact can be considered from the perspective of visual cul-ture studies.'[8]

Within the domain of *aesthetics* such an historicist, social-constructionist and relativist idea of value has been particularly investigated by the insti-tutional theories of art. Whereas contemporary aesthetics has witnessed a significant rebirth of interest in issues that are firmly situated within the coordinates established by Kantian aesthetics—and therefore consid-ers the experience of art in terms of a relationship between subject and object, and investigates the ontological status of aesthetic qualities, the logical status of aesthetic judgements, the nature of aesthetic pleasure, and the possibility of a transcendental foundation of the intersubjectivity of taste—the institutional theories initiated by Danto, Dickie and Becker emphasized instead the role played by a plurality of extrinsic factors labelled as the 'artworld' in drawing the lines that separate art from non-art, and therefore in assigning aesthetic and artistic value. According to all three authors, in an age characterized by an artistic production that makes the distinction between art and non-art objects less and less per-ceptually evident, only a careful description of the subjects, practices and institutions that constitute the 'artworld' can explain such a distinction.

   Institutional theories of art emerged within analytical aesthetics in the context of the debate concerning the possibility of a *definition* of art, and clearly distinguished themselves from *essentialist* or *functionalist* defini-tions.[9] Essentialist or 'real' definitions tried to point out the necessary and sufficient properties that could identify the artistic in universal, a-histori-cal and often normative terms, while functionalist theories such as that of Nelson Goodman explained the artistic quality of artworks in terms of the artistic or aesthetic functioning of certain symbolic systems. Institutional

---

[8] Mieke Bal, 'Visual Essentialism and the Object of Visual Culture', *Journal of Visual Culture* 2.1 (2003) 11.

[9] On the different approaches to the problem of a definition of art, see Nelson Good-man, *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols* (Indianapolis, IN, 1976); Peter Kivy, *Philosophies of Art: An Essay in Differences* (Cambridge, 1997); Arthur Danto, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2nd edn., 1983); Stephen Davies, *Definitions of Art*, (Ithaca, 1991); Oswald Hanfling, 'The Problem of Defini-tion', in *Philosophical Aesthetics. An Introduction,* ed. Oswald Hanfling (Oxford, 1992) 1–40; Robert Stecker, *Artworks: Definition, Meaning, Value* (University Park, PA, 1997); Noël Car-roll, ed., *Theories of Art Today* (Madison, WI, 2000).

theories, in contrast, aimed at explaining how artworks or artistic movements such as the Duchampian *ready-made* or Pop Art have come to be legitimately included in the domain of art. The main problem is therefore that of understanding what establishes the distinction between art and non-art when such a distinction is not rooted in some clearly perceptible qualities of the artistic object. For Arthur Danto, when nothing allows us to distinguish between a work of art and an ordinary object from a physical and perceptual point of view, such a distinction has to rely on a non-perceptible, relational quality which may be identified by the 'artworld.' According to Danto the artworld is essentially made up by theories of art and by a knowledge of art history: 'to see something as art requires something the eye cannot descry—an atmosphere of artistic theory, a knowledge of the history of art: an artworld. . . . What in the end makes the difference between a Brillo box and a work of art consisting of a Brillo Box is a certain theory of art. It is the theory that takes it up into the world of art, and keeps it from collapsing into the real object which it is (in a sense of *is* other than that of artistic identification). Of course, without the theory, one is unlikely to see it as art, and in order to see it as part of the artworld, one must have mastered a good deal of artistic theory as well as a considerable amount of the history of recent New York painting.'[10]

Within such a framework a definition of art is possible, but not in terms of a set of qualities which would belong to all works of art. Rather, a definition has to refer to the whole set of subjects, practices and institutions which contribute to determine art's apparent autonomy within the context of the social sphere. Developing Danto's ideas, Dickie insists on such a composite nature of the artworld, within which artworks occupy a certain *position*: 'By an institutional approach I mean the idea that works of art are art as the result of the position they occupy within an institutional framework or context.'[11] He presents the artworld as a 'multi-placed network of great complexity', constituted by the totality of the 'Artworld systems', each of which establishes 'a framework for the presentation of a work of art by an artist to an Artworld public.'[12] Becker, finally, uses the expression 'artworlds' in the plural in order to underline the plurality of the systems which converge in defining and legitimizing the field of the artistic.[13]

---

[10] Danto, 'The Artworld', in Danto, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace*, 580–1.
[11] George Dickie, 'The New Institutional Theory of Art', in *Aesthetics: Proceedings of the 8th International Wittgenstein Symposium,* ed. Rudolf Haller (Vienna, 1984) 57.
[12] Dickie, 'The New Institutional Theory of Art'.
[13] See Becker, *Art Worlds*.

An interesting aspect of the definition of art elaborated by the institutional theories is that it is a purely descriptive definition. Within such theories, the term 'art' ceases to be used as an evaluative or even honorific term, and becomes a descriptive term which identifies a set of practices in relation to an artworld constituted by art theories and histories as well as by a whole spectrum of gatekeepers within which a prominent role is played by art criticism, which I will now discuss.

The status of value judgements in *art criticism* has been recently at the centre of a debate in the attempt to understand the reasons why certain influential trends in current critical practice have progressively distanced themselves from the evaluative, normative and legislative approach to art criticism that was characteristic of the writings of critics such as Clement Greenberg. In *What Happened to Art Criticism?* James Elkins, having underlined the paradoxical situation of an art criticism that proliferates in catalogues and magazines but seems to have completely lost the authority and cultural relevance it had until the 1960s, lists the most common forms of contemporary art criticism and notes the near ubiquity of a form of criticism which prefers to describe and interpret rather than to evaluate:

> In the last three or four decades, critics have begun to avoid judgements altogether, preferring to describe or evoke the art rather than say what they think of it.... [Art criticism] also receded from the firing lines of cultural critique into the safer and more protected domains of localized description and careful evocation.[14]

Of course, one could say that every description presupposes implicitly some form of judgement, and that the very fact of qualifying something as 'art' is in itself an evaluative act. Still, the decline of the identification of art criticism with evaluative judgement is a striking phenomenon, the causes of which lie, on the one hand, in the development of institutional or functional art theories which emphasize a descriptive rather than an evaluative approach to art and, on the other hand, in the desire by a generation of critics who came to prominence in the 1970s, to break entirely with modernist art criticism and with its exercise of normative judgements based on the leading principles of art's autonomy, reflexivity and medium-specificity, of avant-garde art's essential distinction from 'kitsch' mass culture, and so forth. Detaching itself from such a tradition, the art criticism which has presented itself under the labels of the 'anti-aesthetic'

---

[14] James Elkins, *What Happened to Art Criticism?* (Chicago, IL, 2003) 12–3.

or of 'institutional critique' has underlined the fact that the main objective of art criticism should not be to produce new judgements but to put aesthetic and evaluative judgements themselves under close scrutiny.[15] It therefore generates a sort of 'critique of criticism' which emphasizes the socially and institutionally constructed nature of artistic value.

In her introduction to *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*, Rosalind Krauss wrote that the objective of art criticism should be that of exhibiting 'those choices that precede and predetermine any act of judgement.'[16] The institutional critique promoted by critics such as Benjamin Buchloh and Andrea Fraser further underlines the importance of such a 'meta-critical' task for art criticism, the aim of which should be that of evidentiating the criteria and the institutions which contribute in conferring cultural value, authority and legitimation on artworks. According to Andrea Fraser, 'the divisions of labour within the art world are fundamentally divisions of the labour of legitimation. The latter are fundamental to the production of belief in the value of the work of art by providing an appearance of autonomous investments or autonomous judgements that appear, to varying degrees, as sublimated with respect to the material dimensions of that value and to the personal and professional stakes that participants in the field have in the production of that art.'[17]

In the approach to the question of aesthetic judgement which has been developed by such an institutional critique, what prevails is once more a historicist, social-constructionist and relativist idea of value, which is conceived as the by-product of the dynamics of an artworld construed as a matrix of institutional, economic, and power relations. Certainly, the form of art criticism privileged by the institutional critique, which dates back to the beginning of the 1980s and has developed mainly in the context of academic research, does not summarize the great variety of styles of criticism which are currently being practised. A significant trend in the contemporary reflection on art criticism has called for a return to judgement and evaluation stating, as James Elkins does in his *What Happened to Art*

---

[15] Hal Foster, ed., *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (Seattle, WA, 1983). For a reflection on the shift from art criticism to second-order reflection on judgement see also Victor Burgin, *The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Postmodernity* (Basingstoke, 1986).
[16] Rosalind Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, MA, 1985).
[17] Benjamin Buchloh 'Round Table: The Present Conditions of Art Criticism', *October* 100 (Spring, 2002) 214.

Criticism?, that art criticism should be 'a forum for the concept and opera-
tion of judgement', and not only 'a meditation *on* judgement.'[18] There are
also those such as David Joselit, who think that criticism should abandon
the exclusive reference to the domain of art, as still happened with the
institutional critique, in order to open itself up to the wider field of visual
culture. Such a position gives us now the opportunity to examine how the
status of value and value judgements has been discussed within the field
of visual culture studies.

Originating both as a branch of cultural studies characterized by a spe-
cific interest in the visual and as an extension of art history, the field of
visual studies developed with the aim of moving beyond the exclusive
focus on artistic images and artistic forms of spectatorship in order to take
into consideration the entire domain of images and the entire spectrum
of visual experiences and practices of looking. The priority traditionally
assigned by art history to artistic images is here contested on the basis of
that clear-cut distinction between cultural and historical significance and
artistic value which had already been formulated within the tradition of
art history by Alois Riegl in his essay 'The Modern Cult of Monuments'
(1903).[19]
    On the basis of such a distinction, visual studies analyses the status
of value with a double objective: that of understanding both the histori-
cal and social criteria according to which a certain value is assigned to
images, and the processes by which the values, beliefs and meanings
which constitute a certain culture are established and negotiated through
images and practices of seeing. At the root of such an approach there is
that idea of culture as a meaning and value-producing process which has
been developed, among others, by the British cultural theorist Stuart Hall.
According to such a position, culture is not made up by a set of things,
but rather by all the processes and the practices with which individuals

---

[18] Elkins, *What Happened to Art Criticism?*, 84. A strong argument for a return to evalu-
ative criticism is presented also by Noël Carroll in his *On Criticism* (New York and London,
2009).
[19] Alois Riegl, 'Der moderne Denkmalkultus, sein Wesen, seine Entstehung' (1903), Eng.
transl. 'The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin', *Oppositions* 25 (1982)
21–51. On the idea of 'culture' that lies at the basis of visual culture studies, see Matthew
Rampley, 'Visual Culture and the Meanings of Culture', in *Exploring Visual Culture: Defini-
tions, Concepts Contexts*, ed. Matthew Rampley (Edinburgh, 2005) 5–17.

and groups elaborate and exchange meanings and values.[20] With such an idea of culture in mind, Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright in their *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture*, insist on the dynamics of *negotiation* which constitute the fabric of visual culture as a 'fluid and interactive process',[21] emphasizing how meanings, beliefs and values are visually constituted through a complex social interaction among images, viewers, and contexts.

Here again we find an historical, social-constructionist and relativist approach to value, now interpreted according to the perspective of visual culture. If the aim of such a research field is that of studying the 'social construction of the visual' as well as the 'visual construction of the social'—as suggested by W.J.T. Mitchell—the question of value becomes that of understanding how social, historical and artistic values are articulated, established, transmitted, and preserved through our interaction with images.[22]

This capacity of images to generate values and beliefs, and to influence judgements and opinions, has often been regarded in highly critical terms, so much so that an entire current of visual culture studies may be read as the continuation of an 'iconophobic' tradition which includes Adorno and Horkheimer's critique of the 'culture industry', Debord's attacks against the 'society of spectacle', Foucault's analysis of surveillance and disciplinary apparatuses, Baudrillard's discourse on simulation and hyper-reality. Refusing to continue this critical evaluation of the power of images, authors such as W.J.T. Mitchell have emphasized the importance of adopting instead a more neutral, descriptive approach. As he writes in his essay 'The Surplus Value of Images', in which the question of the value and power of images is analysed within the framework of a quasi-biological idea of images as subjective, living, and desiring entities, 'most of the powerful critiques of images in our time, especially visual images, have…been *iconoclastic* in character', in the sense that they have considered images 'as subject to a discipline, an axiology or criteriology that would systematically regulate judgements of value.'[23] Conse-

[20] See Stuart Hall, 'Encoding, Decoding', in *The Cultural Studies Reader,* ed. Simon During (London, 1993) 90–103; Hall, 'Introduction', in *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices,* ed. Stuart Hall (London, 1997) 1–12.

[21] Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright, *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture* (Oxford, 2001) 4.

[22] Mitchell, 'Showing Seeing', 351.

[23] William J.T. Mitchell, 'The Surplus Value of Images', in Mitchell, *What Do Pictures Want?*, 81.

quently, the key question traditionally asked about 'images and value' has been that of how to evaluate images and expose false ones. Yet, Mitchell argues, the attitude that should instead be adopted is completely different: images should be studied 'as a source of value, rather than objects of evaluation', as 'active players in the game of establishing and changing values ... capable of introducing new values into the world and thus of threatening old ones.'[24] For Mitchell, the double extremism which has traditionally dominated every critical position towards images—the idea that 'images are all-powerful forces, to blame for everything from violence to moral decay', or that 'they are denounced as mere 'nothings', worthless, empty, and vain'—should be abandoned in favour of a new approach to the question of value which focuses on their status of entities endowed with their own life, desires, and their own evolution, like viruses which depend on a 'host organism', and which need a human contribution in order to proliferate.[25]

Seen from this perspective, the value of images lies in their *vitality*, that is, in their capacity to proliferate from medium to medium, reproducing themselves continuously, and exercising some form of power in the elaboration of beliefs, identities and values which constitute a certain culture. Once more, value is examined in social and constructionist terms, within a paradigm which refers both to the constructionism of Nelson Goodman as well as to Marx's theses on the fetishism of commodities and on surplus value:

> Perhaps the most interesting consequence of seeing images as living things is that the question of their value (understood as vitality) is played out in a social context. We need to ponder that we don't just evaluate images; images introduce new forms of value into the world, contesting our criteria, forcing us to change our minds.... Images are not just passive entities that coexist with their human hosts, any more than the microorganisms that dwell in our intestines. They change the way we think and see and dream. They refunction our memories and imaginations, bringing new criteria and new desires into the world.... They are, in philosopher Nelson Goodman's words, 'ways of worldmaking' that produce new arrangements and perceptions of the world.[26]

Even though formulated in different terms within the fields of art history, aesthetics, art criticism and visual culture studies, the attitude towards

---

[24] Mitchell, 'The Surplus Value of Images', 106.
[25] Mitchell, 'The Surplus Value of Images', 77.
[26] Mitchell, 'The Surplus Value of Images', 92–3.

the question of value that we have described as historicist and relativist appears to be a *Leitmotiv* that for three decades has been running across all these research fields, expressing a common need for a descriptive and interpretative analysis of the social, historical, and institutional conditions that influence aesthetic judgements and make them possible. Nevertheless, the recent calls in favour of a return to the practice of actively engaged, evaluative criticism, both in relationships to artworks and to images circulating in the domain of contemporary visual culture, show that the different attitudes towards the question of value held by art historians, aestheticians, art critics or exponents of visual studies, far from having been overcome, are still a contentious issue and a source of productive tensions to be explored.

THE IDEA OF THE CANON AND CANON FORMATION
IN ART HISTORY

Hubert Locher

Canon: A Critical Term for Art History?

The use of the word 'canon' in a critical sense in art-historical literature is, surprisingly, of fairly recent date. It is explained in one dry sentence in Duro and Greenhalgh's *Essential Art History*: 'In art the term refers to works of a given artist, period or school accepted "into the canon" as genuine … by connoisseurs.'[1] Although the term is used as a central critical category in the six-volume series *Art and its Histories* published by The Open University in the 1990s, it does not figure among the *Critical Terms for Art History*.[2] Nor does it appear in the *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft* published in 2003, although 'Kanonisierung' ('canonization') is at least mentioned in the introduction, by which the editor refers to the purportedly canonical status of the one hundred terms selected.[3] Eventually we find a short entry in Jonathan Harris's *Art History: The Key Concepts* (2006).[4]

One reason for this belated appearance might be that the term has not been understood as a critical concept. Traditionally, questions of the canon and of the canonical in art were hardly ever discussed in a critical manner; they were not considered the business of a historical discipline, the task of which was rather, in the first place, to register and, second, to interpret what had been done. Its purpose was not seen explicitly as judging, praising, and finally compiling a selective best-of list of works

---

[1] Paul Duro and Michael Greenhalgh, eds., *Essential Art History* (London, 1992) 73.

[2] See Colin Cunningham and Gill Perry, *Academies, Museums and Canons of Art* (London and New Haven, CT, 1999); Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff, eds., *Critical Terms for Art History* (Chicago, IL, 1996). The term does not appear in the revised 2003 edition either.

[3] Ulrich Pfisterer, ed., *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft: Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe* (Stuttgart, 2003) vii.

[4] See 'Canon, Canonicity' in Jonathan Harris, *Art History: The Key Concepts* (London, 2006) 45–6. For a more recent discussion in reference to contemporary art see Rainer Metzger, ed., 'Über das Kanonische', *Kunstforum International* 162 (2002).

that would eventually be called the 'canon' of art history. More commonly used and intensely debated in other disciplines of the humanities, the term 'canon' is nevertheless firmly rooted in the history of art.[5] Indeed, it is its implicit role in framing judgements and decisions within the discipline that makes the examination of the role of the canon and canon formation all the more pressing.

As a metaphor stemming probably from architecture, it is a basic notion in one of the very earliest Western theories of art: 'Canon' (Greek/Latin for 'measuring rod', 'standard') was the title of a lost theoretical treatise by the Greek sculptor Polykleitos.[6] In his *Natural History* (XXXV, 55), Pliny the Elder relates that other artists called one of the sculptures, the *Doryphoros*, made by Polykleitos, 'canon', because it was considered to be the perfect, proportioned image of man. The term is also used to refer to a model in the sense of a guideline, a set of rules, or a schedule or list of dates serving as reference points. It is important to note that the notion was very early on connected to law, and, even more significantly, to religion. Whereas in early Christianity the term was only used in application to religious law (canonical law), from the fourth century onwards the term was also used in reference to the definitive and authoritative nature of the body of sacred scripture, a use of the term that classical antiquity did not know, neither in application to religious nor to secular literary texts.[7] The word 'canonization' was also used to designate the act by which the

---

[5] A reference to the 'Western canon' of literature in an affirmative sense can be found in Harold Bloom, *The Western Canon: The Books and the School of the Ages* (New York, 1994). Manfred Fuhrmann, *Der europäische Bildungskanon des bürgerlichen Zeitalters* (Frankfurt am Main, 1999) looks back to a once probably functioning 'Bildungs-Kanon' ('canon of cultivated education') in Germany, rather than in Europe. For contributions to the more recent critical discussion see Maria Moog-Grünewald, ed., *Kanon und Theorie* (Heidelberg, 1997); Gerhard R. Kaiser and Stefan Matuschek, eds., *Begründungen des Kanon: Beiträge aus der Literatur- und Kunstwissenschaft, Philosophie und Theologie* (Heidelberg, 2001); Renate von Heydebrand, ed., *Kanon, Macht, Kultur: Theoretische, historische und soziale Aspekte ästhetischer Kanonbildungen* (Stuttgart, 1998).

[6] The history of the word is given by Herbert Oppel, 'Kanon. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula—norma)', special edition of *Philologus* 30.4 (1937). A thorough discussion of the problem can be found in Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1997) 103–29. See also Herbert Beck and Peter C. Bol, eds., *Polyklet: Der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik. Exhibition Catalogue Liebighaus, Museum alter Plastik Frankfurt am Main* (Mainz, 1990); Hans von Steuben, 'Der Doryphoros und der Kanon Polyklets', *Städel-Jahrbuch* 15 (1996) 7–18; Thuri Lorenz, 'Polyklet: die Geschichte vom "Kanon"', in *Festschrift für Götz Pochat zum 65. Geburtstag,* ed. Johann Konrad Eberlein (Vienna, 2007) 11–19.

[7] See the introduction to Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate: On the Origins and Formation of the Bible* (Peabody, MA, 2002) 13, and Eugen

Christian Church declared a person to be a saint, or the imposition by (canonical) law on the whole Church of the universal public veneration of an individual.

Today a canon is usually understood as a group of works, objects or, more often, texts, recognized within a defined social group as being exemplary and thus embodying a set of binding provisions. Undeniably, some of the religious connotations remain present in the modern use of the term; as the Egyptologist Jan Assmann has pointed out, this is evident when we still understand a canon not only, as in antiquity, as the correct measure made to the right proportion, but also as the right thing according to a higher authority.[8]

Generally, to canonize a set of objects, works or texts, means to declare that they are of the highest importance as timeless models of their kind. It is obvious that there are problems if one were to speak in this sense of canonization and of a canon when art history as a scholarly discipline is concerned. In the course of the nineteenth century art historians increasingly distanced themselves from normative judgements, focusing more and more on the 'objective' registration and description of art-historical 'facts'. This did not mean to deny that certain works should be counted amongst the 'Denkmäler der Kunst' ('monuments of art'), or that some 'Masters' were more 'important', or just more interesting than others. However, art historians usually tried to evaluate not an object's *absolute* value, but its relative or historical value, which became apparent when an object had been regarded by other artists in some way as a model. Although such value judgements were widely practiced and accepted, most art historians still usually avoid addressing these issues in a critical way, implicitly suggesting that it was not for them to select and decide about the prominence to be given to an object, but rather to 'history', the 'market', or 'the public'.

Even those art historians interested more in what we may call the aesthetic aspects or aesthetic value of art would not usually see their task in identifying a list of master models, but rather in describing the specific aesthetic quality of certain works, without indulging too much in questions of ranking. On the other hand, it cannot be disputed that aspects of ranking were and still are of considerable importance in the art world.

Ulrich, 'The Notion and Definition of the Canon', in McDonald and Sanders, *The Canon Debate*, 21–35.

 [8] Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, 115.

When, in the thirteenth century in the region of the Île de France, rival cities each tried to build the highest and most beautiful cathedral, just to give one obvious example from medieval history, it can be taken for granted that they were acting in a competitive situation. Likewise artists of the modern era, from the Renaissance onwards, were constantly looking at each other's work, trying to create works of outstanding and exemplary character, more beautiful, grand or significant than those of their rivals. This sense of competition is epitomized in the literary work of the artist and writer Giorgio Vasari, sometimes said to be the father of art history, who, in his *Vite de pittori* lists the biographies of Italian artists according to their achievements, suggesting that all artists were trying to surpass their predecessors, thus setting up both the idea of progress and a canon of the most important (Italian) artists of the then past two centuries.[9]

Art historians of more recent times may argue that while artists have always striven to create works worthy of universal praise, their own task as historians was merely to observe, describe and analyse these works in an appropriate way; according to this view the question of ranking would be a historical phenomenon, and the role of the art historian would thus be to discern the evidential record of previous qualitative judgements. But this approach seems to be too simple in assuming the possibility of a 'disinterested' historian. If there are good reasons to distance oneself in art-historical practice from partisanship with regard to art production, one has nevertheless to acknowledge that the art historian inevitably is and always has been a player in the game. Any historian has to make choices, deciding which work to think about, to publish, or to exhibit. His or her choices involve value judgements, which sooner or later contribute to the establishing of a set of objects that become more visible, are discussed more, and thus deemed more valuable than others, which results in what one has called the 'canon of art history'.

Canon Formation and Collective Identity

A canon, in general, is a system of reference produced in a certain cultural context. Canon formation as a historical process may occur especially, as Jan Assmann argues in his survey of cultural memory in early advanced civilizations, if a society is in crisis. This applies to the formation of the

---

[9] Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de più eccellenti architetti, pittori et scultori italiani, da Cimabue insino a' tempi nostri* (Florence, 1550; 2nd enlarged edn. 1568).

canons of sacred scriptures in ancient cultures, such as Egypt, or Israel, or in early Christianity. The canon is, according to Assmann, 'the principle of a collective constitution and stabilization of identity, which is at the same time the foundation of individual identity, as a medium of individuation by socialization, and of self-realization by insertion into the "normative conscience of an entire population" (Habermas). A canon constitutes a nexus between the identity of the ego and collective identity. It represents the society as a whole and at the same time a system of values and interpretations, to which the single person avows and to which he or she builds his or her identity as a member of the society'.[10] In this sense, canon formation is concerned with the formation and confirmation of individual and group identity. The individual finds her- or himself addressed and represented in the canon. Its function is to give orientation, which can only be achieved if the reference system is relatively stable.

Whether such a reference system exists in Western art cannot easily be answered. It seems doubtful that we can reasonably talk of a canon of Western art in the same sense as we can talk of a canon of sacred scriptures. It is true that in the art-historical literature of the last one and a half centuries we find certain names and objects time and again. But a closer look at the history of the formation of this list would show that it is constantly changing; some names disappear, while new ones are added. The more established names appear in different narratives, are valued and interpreted in different ways, according to the relative position of the writer who is trying to situate him- or herself and his or her social group by referring to objects within the larger system of art, or rather European or Western art in general. While these narratives are suggesting or even explicitly supporting the idea of a timeless and all-encompassing canon of works of Western art, even of 'world art', which is used as a reference system to establish sub-canons such as national canons, we have to assume that there is a certain range within which choices are made, and that even the criteria of selection are subject to change.

Thus, the so called canon of Western art (or the canon of art history) seems to be permanently under construction, which contradicts the very notion of a canon, or forces us to introduce the concept of an 'open canon'. Even if historians, collectors, dealers or politicians tried to establish 'the' canon of art, there is at any time a very broad set of possibly acceptable canonical objects, which are all artefacts classified as 'art'. From this field

---

10 Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, 127.

the objects of reference are chosen and marked as outstanding by critics, art historians, dealers, and collectors, according to the specific interests of the person acting or the group or institution this person represents, and laid down in some kind of listing—such as, for example, the national lists of historical monuments protected by national law, or the Unesco world heritage list, or, of course, the many art-historical surveys recommended to students of art history. Moreover we should take into consideration that not only the selection of artefacts canonized in such ways, but also the criteria according to which artefacts are classified as 'art' is mutable. We have thus not one 'art-historical canon' but competing canons, canons embodying national identity, or canons for groups of individuals within it, who are trying to develop a specific identity, not in contradiction, but in relation to society at large by using the reference system of art. Each canon will have its own specific history, structure and purpose.

Examples of Canon Formation—Canons of World Art and National Canons

Given this situation we should rather talk of continuous canon formation than of an open or closed canon of art or art history; or we could say that, in fact, no set canon in the strict sense (as a closed reference system) exists but a tradition of canon formation, which is characteristic for Western culture. Canon formation can be observed in Western culture since antiquity. Probably the first list intended as some kind of a canon of works of art was established in the third century BC as the famous 'Seven Wonders of the World'.[11] These Seven Wonders, or objects to be admired, are usually not ranked, but each example is remembered as a superior and unsurpassed achievement of its kind. Yet, each one of these monuments can also be remembered as representing the specific cultural power of one more or less defined nation playing an important role at some time within the ancient world. This is certainly how the Roman poet Martial (40–104 AD) read the list. In his *Liber Spectaculorum* he mentions the seven monuments as representing their respective nations, in order to compare them to the cultural power of Rome, epitomized in a newly

---

[11] See Peter Clayton and Martin Price, eds., *The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World* (London, 1988); Kai Brodersen, *Die Sieben Weltwunder: Legendäre Kunst- und Bauwerke der Antike*, 2nd rev. edn. (Munich, 2004). The first complete list handed down might be that compiled by Antipatros of Sidon between 150 and 120 BC.

added monument, the Flavian amphitheatre.[12] This is a characteristic example of somebody trying to expand and differentiate the canon.

When the list of the Seven Wonders was reactivated in the Renaissance, the canon of antiquity was treated as a fixed and authoritative reference system. We can observe now that monuments of the authors' own time and nation were added or compared with the canonical wonders of the ancient world. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the German humanist Jacob Wimpfeling from Strasbourg referred to the Seven Wonders in order to glorify the Minster of his hometown as a structure that surpassed all buildings of Europe.[13] Some two centuries later, the historical perspective became more important. We find the Seven Wonders of the antique world prominently placed on the first pages of Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach's *Outline of a Historical Architecture* ('Entwurf einer historischen Architektur') of 1721.[14] In this first attempt at a history of world architecture all objects are allocated to their nations of origin, following the purpose of showing the 'building manners' of each, finally leading to the present time and back to the European world, or more precisely to the work of Fischer von Erlach himself. We may see in this approach an early mode of discriminating national styles, which became common towards the end of the eighteenth century, and a leading category for structuring the large art-historical handbooks of the nineteenth century. For the present discussion the most significant aspect of Fischer von Erlach's text is his reference to a traditional canon, which was global and international, in order comparatively to define his own manner, connecting his own and his nation's works of architecture to the acknowledged monuments of great art.

Architectural objects are by nature immobile and permanently on public view and thus often from the outset conceived of as symbols of a local group. The situation is different when we look at a painting or a sculpture. Given the fragile character of these works, their mobility and the fact that a painter or a sculptor usually produced a greater multitude of works in

---

[12] See Kathleen Coleman, ed., *Martial: Liber Spectaculorum* (Oxford, 2006); see, too, Brodersen, *Die Sieben Weltwunder*, 14–15.

[13] Jakob Wimpfeling, *Epitome rerum Germanicarum* (1505) (Marburg, 1562) 70. See Harold Hammer-Schenk, 'Architektur und Nationalbewußtsein—Wandlungen vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert', in *Funkkolleg Kunst: Eine Geschichte der Kunst im Wandel ihrer Funktionen* I, ed. Werner Busch (Munich 1987) 559-85.

[14] Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, *Entwurf einer historischen Architectur, in Abbildung unterschiedener berühmten Gebäude, des Alterthums und fremder Völcker* (Vienna, 1721).

a lifetime, it has been common practice since ancient Greece and Rome to remember, in the first place, the names of the artists, and only in the second place their works. There thus tend to be lists of canonical painters rather than lists of canonical paintings. In Vasari's *Vite*, important artists and their biographies are listed in the first instance and only secondarily, lists of works of art are noted. Their works document, in this context, the life achievements of artists even when they are meticulously described and characterized. Paintings and sculptures are therefore treated as exemplary representations of the work of an artist in its entirety, while this is the case to a lesser degree with regard to architecture. The exemplary nature of paintings and statues makes for their status of collectibles that can stand for wider artistic and cultural contexts, whereas architectural monuments can only be assembled in their representations (descriptions, illustrations). Collections of man-made 'mirabilia', and, among them, paintings and sculptures, have been of crucial importance for the formation of the notion of art in modern times, and substantial to the formation of the canon of art. Since the sixteenth century it has been common practice to collect and display paintings as works of art according to national or regional 'schools'. One can observe the formation of sub-canons within these partitions, but the early collectors, in most cases using their galleries as spaces for political representation, usually did not exclusively collect just the masters of one school but tried to collect works by important masters of the most important schools. This concept is developed and reflected in the literature of art. The small handbook for amateurs of painting, for example, published by the French painter and writer Roger de Piles in 1699, contains among other texts a historical sequence where a canonical list of painters from antiquity to the then present time is given.[15] This list is ordered chronologically but also according to regional or national schools. De Piles mentions the Roman, the Venetian, the Lombard, the German, the Flemish and, finally, the French School. His sequence shows that typically the canonical listing is used to define the writer's own position, placing the French school at the end. Since the late eighteenth century this order became, for some time, the 'logic of the museum', its quintessential example being the Louvre. It was not only the place where the historical collection of paintings of the European schools were shown—among them, of course, most prominently the French—but also where

---

[15] Roger de Piles, *Abregé de la vie des peintres. Avec des reflexions sur leurs ouvrages et un traité du Peintre parfait etc.* (Paris, 1699).

contemporary French painting was exhibited periodically in the nearby 'Salon'. Displaying the canonical frame of reference, the modern museum was to become the most important institution for the formation of art-historical canons, and especially the place where the formation of national canons was staged. In the course of the nineteenth century, these national canons were to become more and more important throughout Europe.

While many modern artists aimed at ranking themselves among the 'great masters' presented in the modern museum, it should also be noted that any collection is a construction in its own right and variable according to the will of the institution, the owner or its curator, and does not necessarily present the frame of reference (canon) observed by the artists working at the time. With regard to the formation of national canons of art we can observe that occasionally the foundation of museums was supported in order to encourage the formation of a local (national) tradition of painting, or with the intent of *differencing* the art-historical canon, by canonizing (or musealizing) the local tradition on the understanding that what could be seen in the museum was part of a canon. In the nineteenth century the institution of art history naturalized such constructions. It was then that art history as a scholarly discipline emerged and flourished, beginning in Germany, with many other countries following in its wake. The discipline was then also institutionalized in state-funded universities, as a result of which it could and did serve in its specific way in articulating and propagating notions of national identity.

Interpreting Canons

If one accepts that canons are not given entities but more or less collectively developed and agreed reference systems, representing sets of values deemed to be important for society as a whole, or for groups within it, then canon formation has to be considered as a social and political enterprise. It is not by chance that the term 'canon' in the modern sense occurred in art-historical literature at a time when some scholars started to see more clearly and address the fact that their discipline was deeply concerned not only with the beautiful and the precious, but with society at large and its values.

One of the first to address the issue was Ernst H. Gombrich. In a lecture delivered in 1973 Gombrich, as a 'humanist', thought it necessary to defend the appreciation of art and the history of art as the history of great achievements of 'great masters', and thus—he uses the word—the 'canon'

of art as the approved list of masterworks serving as models and as an
indispensable reference system against moral and aesthetic 'relativism'.[16]
Gombrich's defence of the canon was directed against those unnamed
social scientists (of Marxist persuasion) who, he thought, considered art
history to be just another social science, or, at best, an *ancilla sociolo-
giae*. The most obvious example might have been Arnold Hauser, whose
Social History of Art Gombrich had reviewed in its English translation
two decades earlier, but he might also have been aware of the interest
of a younger generation of scholars who started in these years critically
to rethink art history. From the beginning, the critique of the traditional
canon of the 'masters' was a central issue, but there seems to have been
an initial hesitation to use the word 'canon'; it does not occur, for exam-
ple, in one of the seminal contributions by Linda Nochlin, who provoca-
tively asked in 1971: 'Why have there been no great women artists?'[17] The
critique of the canon in this sense continued to the 1990s—most of the
time without using the term as a critical concept but with the intention to
expand and broaden the field of study by including marginalized artists,
in particular women, and overlooked artistic genres. It was the feminist
art historian Nanette Salomon who explicitly criticized 'the art-historical
canon' as being 'among the most virulent, and ultimately the most vulner-
able' of canons within academic disciplines.[18] Despite their fundamental
disagreement with approaches like that of Gombrich, radical art histo-
rians rarely went as far as fundamentally reconsidering the principle of
traditional art history, which was, as Adrian Rifkin noticed in 1986, the
production of a 'series of valued objects'. 'More often than not', Rifkin
argued, radical art historians fell 'into line' with traditional art history,
'although they might first insist that the canon gets filled out a bit'.[19]

---

[16] For this see Ernst H. Gombrich, 'Art History and the Social Sciences', in *Ideals and
Idols* (Oxford, 1979) 131–66; Gombrich, 'Canons and Values in the Visual Arts: A Correspon-
dence with Quentin Bell', *Critical Inquiry* 2.3 (1976), reprinted in: *Ideas and Idols*, 167–83.

[17] Linda Nochlin, 'Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?' in Nochlin, *Women,
Art, and Power and Other Essays* (New York, 1988) 145–78. First published in 1971.

[18] Nanette Salomon, 'The Art Historical Canon: Sins of Omission', in *(En)gendering
Knowledge: Feminists in Academe*, ed. Joan E. Hartman and Ellen Messer-Davidow (Knox-
ville, TN, 1991) 220–34. A German translation was published in *kritische berichte* 21.4 (1993)
27–40. The chapter was republished in Donald Preziosi, ed., *The Art of Art History: A Criti-
cal Anthology* (Oxford and New York, 1998) 344–55; see also, in Preziosi's anthology, the
explanation of the term 'canon' in the glossary, 577.

[19] Adrian Rifkin, 'Art's Histories', in *The New Art History*, ed. Alan L. Rees and Frances
Borzello (London, 1986) 157–63, quoted 159. For an interesting approach to the problem
see Karen-Edis Barzman, 'Feminists, Postmodernism, and the History of Art', *The Journal
of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 52.3 (1994) 327–39.

The problem of the art-historical canon was then brought to the attention of the readers of *The Art Bulletin* in 1996, as part of the series 'A Range of Critical Perspectives', where several authors presented their views on 'Rethinking the Canon', which was approached from different areas of the study of visual culture; this involved not only an expansion of the traditional canon, but a critical analysis of canons *per se* and canon formation.[20] Griselda Pollock's study, published in 1999, attempted to 'difference the canon' by trying to relate a feminist re-reading of canonical modern 'masters' with readings of canonical artists of feminist art history.[21] But even this ambitious book consciously remained a contribution to the project of expanding and reforming the canon from within art history, without aiming, as the author underlines, for the 'more political' option of abolishing canons altogether, which would imply the inclusion of all cultural artefacts as having equal significance. This latter option would in fact mean discarding the notion of the work of art entirely. In this way, one would dispose of the problem by leaving the field of art history and embarking on the larger project of 'visual culture studies'. If this remains an option—and it is surely becoming more attractive in times when 'visuality' is steadily growing in importance as a cultural form—it seems useful, nevertheless, to concentrate on the still more or less definable and well-institutionalized field of 'art' in order to analyse and understand the mechanisms and functions of this protean instance of Western culture in the multitude of its meanings. This would include, of course, the study of the institutions regulating and organizing it by studying their strategies and arguments, among them the process of canonization.

Today, it is generally acknowledged that canon formation is still a key issue in art history. Donald Preziosi rightly observed that because of the 'core interest of the discipline of art history in questions of quality, taste, and social and historical significance, the systemic institutional role of "canonization" has remained intact'.[22] In his introduction to

---

[20] Michael Camille, Zeynep Celik, John Onians, Adrian Rifkin and Christopher B. Steiner, 'Rethinking the Canon', *The Art Bulletin* 78 (1996) 198–217; Marlite Halbertsma, 'The Call of the Canon: Why Art History Cannot Do Without', in *Making Art History: A Changing Discipline and Its Institutions,* ed. Elizabeth C. Mansfield (New York, 2007) 16–30. See, too, Anna Brzyski, ed., *Partisan Canons* (Durham, NC, 2007), especially Anna Brzyski, 'Introduction: Canons and Art History', 1–25.

[21] Griselda Pollock, *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories* (London and New York, 1999).

[22] Preziosi, *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, 577: 'Many of the debates over art-historical "theory" and "methodology" during the last quarter of the twentieth century also concerned the valorization or canonization of specific subject matters worthy of

The New Art History Jonathan Harris states that he will have to return 'many times . . . to the definition and problems of the canon—that is, the set of artefacts deemed worthy of study, and by extension to those forms of study equally regarded as legitimate within the discipline—and to the ways and contexts in which canons are assembled and maintained'.[23] It seems that there still is some way to go in this direction. In order to understand what art history is actually about, it still seems useful to explore the mechanisms and purposes of canon formation, to ask what 'the' canon in art history actually might be or rather, what canons do we have and why they have been constructed, and how do they work in, for example, museums, or archives, by representations, reproductions, and images? To achieve such a critique of canon formation, one needs to broaden the view, to frame 'the' canon, and investigate the inclusions in relation to the exclusions that have been made. The principle of canon formation being that of selection, it is important to know the criteria, as well as the pool of objects, from which selections are made.

Having answered these questions, we might know more about the use of canons or the canonical, and we might then proceed to the big question of whether we need something like a canon of works of art at all. But this is of secondary importance because, obviously, art history still continues to be very much about establishing or confirming selections of symbolic objects, declaring some of them to be of special importance, more worthy of remembrance than others, more beautiful and desirable than others—for reasons still to be explained, and, as history shows, somewhat changeable.

---

professional or public attention. In this regard, one group's "masterpieces" and another's "politically correct" or "socially relevant" artworks perform equivalent disciplinary roles in maintaining hierarchical distinctions among cultural objects.'

23 Jonathan Harris, *The New Art History: A Critical Introduction* (London, 2001) 10.

EUROPEAN HERITAGE: UNITY IN DIVERSITY?

Brian Graham

Heritage and the Formation of Identities

The tension between economic integration and cultural diversity within the European Union (EU) has long been recognized as a key tension within the European project. While the Member States have now opted for economic integration, at the same time they wish to maintain their diversity in terms of culture. Moreover, few of these countries are free of internal cultural conflicts and tensions. Therefore, the rhetoric of 'Unity in diversity' adopted by the EU in the Constitutional Treaty signed in Rome on 29 October 2004, applies equally to the union and to many of its component Member States. Moreover, it *is* rhetoric—what does it mean? The subsequent enlargements of the EU from the original six states of the European Economic Community to 2008's twenty-seven countries, stretching from the Atlantic to the Belorussian border and from the Arctic Circle to Crete, have created a much deeper economic union but have also accentuated the dilemma of meaning of 'Europeanization' and 'Europeanness' by bringing more and more national, regional and local narratives—and the tensions between them—into play.

The ideas of belonging implicit in such narratives can be articulated in many ways. The focus here is on European heritage and the overarching aim of this chapter is to examine the linkages between identity and heritage against the background of the conceptual debate on the processes of Europeanization and the contested meanings of Europeanness. Identity is about belonging, about the ways in which communities are defined and made specific and differentiated. Identity is thus about inclusion but, equally, it is about the exclusion of those who do not 'qualify' for membership. Identity is often associated with space and place, most especially at the national scale. During the 1990s, it became fashionable to argue that identities were becoming 'disembedded' from bounded localities and the traditional frameworks of nation, ethnicity, class and kinship.[1] At the core

---

[1] See, for example, Manuel Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society* (Oxford, 1996); Castells, *The Power of Identity* (Oxford, 1998).

of such ideas lay the key assertion that global networks have diminished the importance of place and traditions, ruptured boundaries and created hybrid, inbetween spaces. In the bleak epoch that has evolved since 2001, this all now seems something of an exaggeration. Hybridity and transnational identities may, for example, counter and complicate nationalist ideologies but, in Europe, the national framing of belonging is seen once again as a defensible agenda. This points, however, to a prime characteristic of identity in that it operates at a number of scales—the local community, the region, the nation, the EU and even, perhaps, a global scale. Historically, however, the national scale has been the most powerful as the states of Europe emerged through a process of fusing together localities and regions around power cores and the use of ethnic criteria to delimit state boundaries.

There are many building blocks to identity—language, religion, gender, a common history, a common enemy—but the focus here is on heritage. This is less an agreed concept throughout Europe than a term with divergent meanings and interpretations. It is often invoked with relation to conservation, the German literature on cultural heritage, for example, being strongly focused on the protection of the country's rich resource of historical monuments and the integration of the conservation of historic buildings with urban planning.[2] The emphasis in this chapter, however, is very much more on the prevailing trend in the anglophone literature which predominantly regards heritage as a contested discourse that can be defined as the meanings attributed to the past in the present and is concerned with the interplay of memory, identity, dissonance and place.[3] Whatever the perspective, however, all heritage involves deliberate selec-

---

[2] See, for example, Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz, http://www.denkmalschutz.de/home.html (accessed 14 September 2010); John Soane, 'The Renaissance of Cultural Vernacularism in Germany', in *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*, ed. Gregory J. Ashworth and Peter J. Larkham (London, 1994) 159–77.

[3] For an overarching discussion of heritage and identity, see: Brian Graham and Peter Howard, eds., *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* (Aldershot, 2008); Laurajane Smith, *The Uses of Heritage* (London, 2006) provides an excellent discussion of heritage as a discourse. It is also the case that English is used as a *lingua franca* in much of the heritage literature—see, for example, the publications of the pan-European HERMES project: Sebastian Schröder-Esch, ed., *Practical Aspects of Cultural Heritage: Presentation, Revaluation, Development* (Weimar, 2006); Sebastian Schröder-Esch and Justus H. Ulbricht, eds., *The Politics of Heritage and Regional Development: Actors, Interests, Conflicts* (Weimar, 2006); Dieter Hassenpflug, Burkhardt Kolbmüller and Sebastian Schröder-Esch, eds., *Heritage and Media in Europe: Contributing Towards Integration and Regional Development* (Weimar, 2006).

tion from the infinity of the past and takes two forms. First, intangible heritage refers to ideas, art, music, language and folklore. Tangible material heritage, on the other hand, comprises buildings, landscapes, monuments and the like and provides the focus in this present discussion. It can take the form either of adapting historical landscapes, monuments and buildings to present needs and incorporating them, for example, into urban conservation areas as in France's 100 or so *secteurs sauvegardés* or Cracow's former Jewish ghetto, Kasimierz, or, conversely, of inserting new structures into the landscape that reference the past's relevance to the present.[4] One of the most dynamic and pertinent examples is provided by Berlin's 'emerging memory district', which includes the highly contested Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, sited close to the reimaged Reichstag and Brandenburg Gate; Daniel Libeskind's Jewish Museum; the 'Topography of Terror' site at the old Gestapo headquarters; and the German Historical Museum.[5]

The dichotomy within this intangible/tangible binary is by no means absolute in that heritage is a mentality—a way of seeing and knowing. No heritage value is completely tangible, as the material world and the values attributed to it can be interpreted only through the intangible. Because heritage is about meaning, it is generally contested in that the same objects carry different meanings at the same time. It follows, therefore, that as meanings change through time, so too does the value of heritage as different interpretations are attached in changing circumstances, such as the collapse of Marxist-Leninism in Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980s. John Tunbridge and Greg Ashworth have coined the term 'dissonance' to refer to this discordance or lack of agreement or consistency as to meaning, which they regard as intrinsic to the very nature of heritage.[6] Dissonance arises first from the multiple social, cultural and economic uses of heritage which can be envisaged as a multi-commodified product sold in a multiplicity of markets. Secondly:

> dissonance arises because of the zero-sum characteristics of heritage, all of which belongs to someone and logically, therefore, not to someone else. The creation of any heritage actively or potentially disinherits or excludes those

---

[4] Monika Murzyn, *Kasimierz: The Central European Experience of Urban Regeneration* (Cracow, 2006).

[5] See Karen Till, *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place* (Minneapolis, MN, 2005).

[6] Gregory J. Ashworth and John E. Tunbridge, *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict* (Chichester, 1996).

who do not subscribe to, or are embraced within, the terms of meaning attending that heritage. This quality of heritage is exacerbated because it is often implicated in the same zero-sum definitions of power and territoriality that attend the nation-state and its allegories of exclusivity.[7]

Turning now to focus on how ideas about identity and material heritage help us consider the paradox of unity in diversity in Europe, three particular questions are addressed explicitly in the ensuing discussion. Is there a need for a continental European heritage in addition to national and even more localized manifestations of identity? If so, what is, or could be, the content of such a heritage? Finally, who can create and manage this identity? In pursuing these and related issues, the chapter first considers the conceptual debate on identity in Europe, then moves to position heritage within this context before concluding with an evaluation of the contribution of heritage to the redefinition of tropes of belonging in Europe.

The Contextual Debate

In his monumental account of travelling through the history and geography of twentieth-century Europe, Geert Mak is very conscious of the continent's national biographies and, conversely, of the 'gigantic legitimacy crisis' of the European project.[8] He applauds the resounding success of Europe as a peace process and economic union is clearly well under way but, Mak argues, 'the project will surely fail unless a common cultural, political and, above all, democratic space is soon created alongside the rest'.[9] Thus, it can be argued that the lack of legitimacy accorded to the idea of the European project stems from the absence of a validating cultural consciousness vested in place to compete with national discourses and to which people can commonly subscribe.[10] Indeed, several commentators—Mak among them—argue that Europe is less united now than it was in the past. Gillian Rose, for example, claims that a sense of place does exist at a supranational level, fostered by the Renaissance, Enlightenment and Judeo-Christianity, all of which can be seen as

---

[7] Brian Graham, Gregory J. Ashworth and John E. Tunbridge, *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy* (London, 2000) 24.

[8] Geert Mak, *In Europe: Travels Through the Twentieth Century* (London, 2007) 823.

[9] Mak, *In Europe*, 834.

[10] Brian Graham, 'The Past in Europe's Present: Diversity, Identity and the Construction of Place', in *Modern Europe: Place, Culture, Identity*, ed. Brian Graham (London, 1998) 19–49.

particularly European achievements.[11] But such a sense of place poses obvious difficulties, not least as a basis for the exclusion of ethnic minorities in an increasingly hybrid and diverse Europe.

Moreover, there also remains the question of what can be described as the multiscalar nature of European space. Julian Clark and Alun Jones argue that the spaces of Europeanization are being created by an 'interplay across scales'. On the one hand, there is a diffusion of state-based power and competencies as state sovereignty is challenged by the emergent EU polity. On the other, there is a strengthening of state-based orders, a buttressing of national government and a return to nationalism and its identity iconography. Between these two positions lies the argument that Europeanization is as much a response to global social transformation as to a demand for change in the means of European institutions and governance.[12] One repercussion of globalization in Europe has been to accentuate the importance of the sub-national scales as particular regions and metropoles have benefited to the exclusion of others, leading to an economic geography of Europe that is defined less by national boundaries than by regional ones. As Clark and Jones conclude: 'the inherent tension between states and the supranational political project of building 'Europe' arises precisely because Europeanization processes are both supportive of yet transcend national territory-government-power bases.'[13]

Simultaneously, however, Europe has become a culturally more diverse place as migration both internal within the EU and from external sources has created new dimensions of cultural complexity and hybridity. One of the key issues for societies defined by such 'progressive' geographies of fluidity is that 'claims to rootedness, belonging and attachments to place' are seen by Catherine Nash as 'perpetuating regressive colonial geographies of bounded places and pure cultures'.[14] Such ideas find a marked resonance in Ulrich Beck's impassioned plea for a cosmopolitan vision of Europe that is transformative and transgressive, a counter-image to the 'territorial prison theory of identity, society and politics' that also informs

---

[11] Gillian Rose, 'Place and Identity: A Sense of Place', in *A Place in the World? Place, Cultures and Globalization*, eds. Doreen Massey and Pat Jess (Oxford, 1995) 87–132.

[12] Julian Clark and Alun Jones, 'The Spatialities of Europeanization: Territory, Government and Power in "Europe" ', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33 (2008) 300–18.

[13] Clark, 'The Spatialities of Europeanization', 313.

[14] Catherine Nash, 'Postcolonial Geographies: Spatial Narratives of Inequality and Interconnection', in *Envisioning Human Geography*, eds. Paul Cloke, Phil Crang, and Mark Goodwin (London, 2004) 121.

national stereotyping. Among others, a guiding principle of cosmopolitanism is that it embodies the '*mélange* principle' in which 'local, national, ethnic, religious and cosmopolitan cultures and traditions interpenetrate, interconnect and intermingle'.[15]

Beck sees cosmopolitanism as a sense of boundarylessness but does admit to a resurgence of 'introverted forms of nationalism' that are consciously resistant to cosmopolitanism and globalization, the sense of boundarylessness sitting alongside a longing for the re-establishment of old boundary lines. Such national categories of thought 'make the thought of Europe impossible', particularly 'a Europe of diversity, a Europe that helps diversity to flourish'.[16] Thus the principles of European cosmopolitanism must embody a rejection of national self-determination and nation-building in favour of a European empire of consensus in which former enemies become neighbours.[17] Nevertheless, nationalized stereotypical renditions of European identities remain prevalent; in January 2009, to mark the Czech Presidency of the EU and its motto of 'a Europe without barriers', the Czech artist, David Černý, created an installation, 'Entropa', which was sited in the atrium of the European Council in Brussels, no less. It employed various (and variously offensive) images to represent the EU's Member States—a Turkish toilet for Bulgaria, a lump of gold with a 'for sale' sign for Luxembourg, a Europhobic blank space for the United Kingdom—the apparent point being to underscore the multiplicity of national dislikes and grudges that are the reality of EU politics.[18]

Even if one agrees with Beck's vision, which at heart reflects the idealism in the original concept of European union that the dreadful history of the first half of the twentieth century should never be repeated, it nevertheless creates substantial problems. Diversity is not merely an issue of possibly enriching overlapping and competing layers of place and belonging. It also includes the legacies of scattered minorities, misplaced peoples and misplaced heritages which, as the post-Yugoslavia Balkans and the post-USSR Eastern Europe demonstrate only too well, contain the potential for conflict and atrocity. The national state 'is often perceived to be the outcome of a struggle for democratic freedom by a subordinated

---

[15] Ulrich Beck, *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, trans. Ciaran Cronin (Cambridge, 2006) 7.
[16] Ulrich Beck, 'Nation-state Politics Can Only Fail the Problems of the Modern World', *Guardian*, 15 January 2008, 27.
[17] Ulrich Beck and Edgar Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe* (Cambridge, 2007).
[18] Marina Hyde, 'Thus Spoke Entropa: The EU Defined in an Airfix Model', *Guardian*, 17 January 2009, 36.

group' while regional identity is often justified by recourse to mythologies of subjugation and demands for freedom from the metropolitan centre. The successive enlargements of the EU to incorporate the states of former Eastern Europe have led to the inclusion of countries that are essentially engaged in a process of the national rebuilding and transformation of their economies and identities in a post-Soviet world. Moreover, they bring their own complex histories and, as Monika Murzyn argues, 'a willing return to cultural diversity, and nostalgia for it, are most often present in those Central European countries where it [diversity] is no longer experienced in everyday life' because of the legacy of the ethno-nationalist redrawing of boundaries in the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 and the Holocaust.[19] In the West, migration has also complicated the ethnic mix and, in particular, underlined the vexed relationships between the European cosmos and the Islamic world. In his perceptive analysis of the clash between Islam and Dutch culture, Ian Buruma describes the 'dish cities' of Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague, where the satellite aerials beam in television channels from Morocco, Turkey and the Middle East. Spatial displacement does not preclude identities being defined back to another place, migrants being 'wired to the Islamic world through satellite TV'.[20]

Again, to some extent the lack of legitimacy accorded a European identity stems from the EU's democratic deficit and it is difficult to ascertain the extent of democratic support for the idea of a cosmopolitan Europe. In 2008, the Lisbon Treaty providing for the future organization and enlargement of the EU had to be endorsed by all twenty-seven Member States or it would fall. In twenty-six countries, it was duly ratified by politicians; in the twenty-seventh, the Republic of Ireland, the Lisbon Treaty was subjected to a referendum in which, famously, the Irish electorate voted 'No'. A motley collection of opponents including the neo-Catholic fundamentalist right, the far left, an opportunistic Sinn Féin, the jingoistic British press (which has a substantial market penetration in Ireland) and a shady organization called Libertas (with alleged links to North American capital) combined to defeat the Government's 'Yes' campaign. As the novelist and commentator, Colm Tóibín, argues, the Treaty 'was a godsend to every crank in Ireland, on the left and the right'. This was not a single mutiny but 'twenty different' ones, embracing a medley of often

---

[19] Monika Murzyn, 'Heritage Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe', in Graham and Howard, *Ashgate Research Companion*, 340.

[20] Ian Buruma, *Murder in Amsterdam: The Death of Theo Van Gogh and the Limits of Tolerance* (London, 2006) 54.

conflicting demands, interests, concerns and scales of protest from the
very local to the national. But, he concludes: 'the lack of accountability
and transparency in how decisions are made makes people deeply suspi-
cious of a more powerfully centralized Europe.'[21] It is 'the nation which
ultimately and inevitably returns as the backdrop to the liberal fantasy'[22]
and 'remains a potent rallying cry in Europe'[23] (and worldwide).

   Thus, there are formidable challenges to Beck's cosmopolitan vision.
He claims that because of globalization, cosmopolitanism has 'entered
reality' and this is certainly the case in an empirical and material way—in
Ireland as dramatically as anywhere else in the EU.[24] What is much more
contentious, however, is the extent to which identity narratives have been
reframed—or are capable of being so reframed—to admit to this diver-
sity and hybridity. Beck calls for a radical rethinking of conventional cat-
egories of social and political analysis in understanding a cosmopolitan
Europe. As a means of 'operationalizing' identity narratives, heritage can
be positioned as one of these categories.

Heritage and European Identity

In rethinking heritage as a conventional category of analysis, an imme-
diate problem stems from its national framing and specificity of place.
The concept of heritage as it is understood today arose from one of those
movements—nineteenth-century Romanticism—that could be seen as a
European ideal but also embodied the assumption that 'to be European
[and] espouse European values…was to be at the pinnacle of cultural
achievement and social evolution'.[25] The will to conserve the past ema-
nated from a passionate, educated and elitist minority but was positioned
from the outset within a nationalist framework to the extent that Laura-
jane Smith envisages an 'authorized heritage discourse' that acts to vali-
date a 'set of practices and performances, which populates both popular

---

[21] Colm Tóibín, 'A Godsend to Every Crank in Ireland—on the Left or on the Right',
Irish Times, 14 June 2008, 9.
[22] Kathryn Mitchell, 'Geographies of Identity: Multiculturalism Unplugged', *Progress in
Human Geography* 28 (2004) 648.
[23] Robert S. Peckham, 'Introduction: The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture',
in *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe*, ed. Robert S. Peckham (London,
2003) 2.
[24] Beck, *Cosmopolitan Vision*, 2.
[25] Graham, *Geography of Heritage*, 17.

and expert constructions of 'heritage'.[26] In France, for example, the initial 'definition' of national heritage was through the Romanticist lens of reimagining the medieval Gothic style as exemplified in Eugène Viollet-le-Duc's nineteenth-century restorations of buildings such as Notre-Dame de Paris and even the entire *cité* of Carcassonne. An additional dominant French trend was provided by the provincial replication of nineteenth-century Parisian bourgeois architecture as manifested, for instance, through the ubiquitous mansard roof. Other European countries similarly evolved national styles, as in the Netherlands' seventeenth-century 'Golden Age', exemplified by the step gables of Vermeer's Delft. As Smith argues, the evolution of such national heritage discourses undermines alternative and subaltern ideas about heritage.[27] Explicit here, however, is the consistent dissonance inherent in heritage—a means of articulating the *status quo* and, equally, a potential form of resistance or an expression of difference that, in itself, is likely to be zero-sum—a form of exceptionalism. As David Harvey observes, alongside 'big' national heritage, 'we must not forget the small heritages, which do not always have to take the form of overt resistance to officialdom'[28]—what David Atkinson, in his study of the Hull docklands, has called the heritages of 'mundane' places, the prosaic working environments in which ordinary people spent their everyday lives.[29] Nevertheless, even if not overtly resistant, the idea of 'against' is generally present in the selection and narrating of heritage. It may be benign rather than malign, geographical in privileging the local against the regional or the regional against the national, or cultural in pitting one group against others but, whatever, there is clearly a marked potential for conflictual presentations of heritage.

Another set of difficulties ensues from the economic commodification of heritage and its role in culturally-led regeneration of European cities and regions. While there are sound reasons for qualifying the cliché of the 'Guggenheim effect'—in which the regeneration and transformation of the grim, decayed industrial city of Bilbao is attributed to the catalyst of an internationally recognizable signature building, Frank Gehry's Guggenheim Museum—the key point is that the model is 'believed' elsewhere and

---

[26] Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, 11.
[27] Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, 11.
[28] David C. Harvey, 'The History of Heritage', in Graham and Howard, *Ashgate Research Companion*, 33.
[29] David Atkinson, 'The Heritage of Mundane Places', in Graham and Howard, *Ashgate Research Companion*, 381–96.

has thus been continuously emulated. The branding of cities and regions through culture is intrinsic to Richard Florida's highly influential concept of the 'creative city' and, by extension, region. Florida focuses on the competitive capacities of cities and regions to attract highly mobile creative capital, the basis of the knowledge economy, arguing that 'place is the key economic and social organizing unit of our time'.[30] As exemplified through the repeated and competitive referencing to the past in the contemporary branding of the cities of the French Mediterranean littoral—Montpellier, Nîmes, Marseille, Nice—heritage is fundamental in the branding of such places as being distinctive from others—indeed, distinguishing identities are as crucial for the successful institutionalization of cities and regions as they are for states—but, in so doing, it is often the case that stereotypical representations of belonging—even if presented through modish postmodern tropes—are employed alongside the paraphernalia of zero-sum identity—at whatever scale. Hence, people are still defining themselves and their spaces, both for cultural and economic reasons, through territorial markers at all levels in the European spatial hierarchy.

It is within this context that the question: 'does Europe need a heritage?' has to be posed. In one sense, the affirmative answer is very obvious in that heritage is a vital consumer product in European tourism and culturally-led urban and regional regeneration. But, in addressing the wider, more difficult questions of the legitimacy and democratic deficit of the European project, there also seems a palpable requirement for an iconography of identity that might transcend national and regional belonging. There are multiple layers of identity, each of which—including the idea of Europe itself—requires an intersecting and ultimately reconcilable heritage. If cosmopolitanism is to be a realizable goal, in many ways it is as an additional scale of belonging that, while it will have ramifications for the narratives at other scales, cannot replace them. A European heritage identity is thus important to legitimate the idea of European union; it has to transcend the nation-state and region, yet respect their integrity, and it has to encompass diversity and multiculturalism within those states and across Europe. But what might constitute the possible content of such a heritage?

Possible responses to this question have been proposed elsewhere but, in essence, they can be divided into two categories: the heritage of the

---

30 Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* (New York, 2002) xix.

idea of European unity; and a heritage of the unity of European ideas. Taking, first, the idea of European union, this began in the aftermath of the Second World War with the powerful idealistic motive that the conflicts of the twentieth century must never be repeated. Norman Davies estimates that military losses in the two world wars amounted to around twenty-three million European deaths, while it is calculated that some twenty-seven million European citizens were killed during Second World War, of whom six million died in the Holocaust.[31] Thus European union has a clear and comprehensible narrative and goal.

> There is, however, one practical but almost insurmountable difficulty. Very few resources, whether buildings, events or personalities from the European past, could be used to shape such a European heritage in competition with the resources available at the national level. The summits and signings that mark critical moments, the politicians and administrators responsible for creating and fostering the European idea . . . the buildings created to house them and the cities in which they are located, are unable to compete successfully in popular imaginations with the personalities, events and structures which underlie national—or even regional—heritage narratives.[32]

Pasts can certainly be rewritten, as in Eastern Europe after the Second World War, and again after the collapse of the Soviet Union at the end of the 1980s. In Warsaw, for instance, post-socialist revisionism reflects resurgent Polish nationalism, the reconstructed 'old town' (inscribed as a World Heritage Site in 1980), destroyed by the Germans in 1944 as the Red Army watched from the eastern banks of the Vistula, now standing at the centre of a swathe of post-socialist memorialization marking not just Polish suffering at the hands of the Nazis, the martyrdom of the Warsaw Rising of 1944, but also Soviet culpability in war crimes such as Katyn Forest and its post-war oppression of the Polish people. The EU has no mechanisms to achieve such rewriting or even remotely to counteract the powerful national and regional urges that underpin them.

Turning to heritage of the unity of European ideas, a more acceptable approach to heritage content might be to designate as European those ideas, aesthetic creations and activities that by their very nature were continental rather than national. As Beck and others have argued, this could be positioned as the recovery of authentically European traditions of openness and tolerance to others. Much tangible and intangible heritage

---

[31] Norman Davies, *Europe: A History* (Oxford, 1996).
[32] Graham, *Geography of Heritage*, 228.

like High Gothic cathedrals, romantic castles, utopian Renaissance town planning, art, symphonic music and even folk dancing would be potential components of such a heritage. Beck himself cites the example of Munich, his home city, but the *mélange* principle seems to be defined as the multicultural composition of the city's soccer team, Bayern Munich, and the city's literary influences, most notably that of Thomas Mann. While sport undoubtedly has a role to play as a potent—but generally partisan—manifestation of popular culture, literature, like classical music, art and power buildings, is essentially elitist, in that is representative of the heritage of a white, probably masculine, European world that is closed to many if not most of its citizens and is largely invisible to migrants and ethnic minorities. Excluded from the iconography of the public realm—as Keld Buciek, Jørgen Bærenholdt and Kristine Juul demonstrate in their study of heritage and migrants from the former Yugoslavia now resident in Denmark—the home has become the memory site for such groups, the record of the journey and the locus of repeated visits—both actual and virtual—to the homeland.[33]

Moreover, given the ubiquity of the heritage of violence and tragedy, any potential heritage of European integration would be eclipsed by that of atrocity, war and nationalism in Europe which is markedly at odds with the idea of a common Europeanness. Throughout Europe, contested pasts are manifested in battlefields, and the landscapes of death and memory that cluster so thickly across the low-lying plains extending through Belgium and eastern France towards Paris. But these sombre landscapes of cemeteries and memorials to the missing, most famously Lutyens's Thiepval Arch on the Somme and Blomfield's Menin Gate in Ieper (Ypres), do not necessarily negate the notion of Europeanness. Although few places on Earth have been fought over so continuously, one of the primary functions of European economic and political integration is to ensure that such carnage never occurs again and, as Michael Heffernan for one has argued, the war cemeteries can be read as conveying no real sense of sacrifice to the nation-state. Rather they are immortal, sacred and essentially apolitical, underpinning the need for a Europeanness that removes the possibility

---

[33] Jørgen Bærenholdt, Keld Buciek, and Kristine Juul, 'Whose Heritage? Immigration and Place Narratives in Denmark', *Geografiska Annaler. Series B*, 88 (2006) 185–97; Keld Buciek and Kristine Juul, ' "We Are Here Yet We Are Not Here": The Heritage of Excluded Groups', in Graham and Howard, *Ashgate Research Companion*, 105–24.

of war forever.[34] Thus the memorials, graves and battlefields of Picardy, the Chemin des Dames and Flanders—clearly national heritage—might also be construed as a heritage of European reconciliation, testimony to the unacceptable and shared suffering. As Paul Gough observes, 'recently built war museums, including "L'Historial de la Grande Guerre" at Peronne and "In Flanders Fields" at Ieper (Ypres), have engaged more fully with their audiences, creating participatory and interactive exhibits that genuinely attempt to engage all levels of involvement and suffering'.[35]

But more widely, the question is: should the content of European heritage and thus European identity embrace the distasteful and unacceptable—the memorialization of the Serbian massacre of an estimated 8,000 Muslim Bosnians in 1995 and Auschwitz-Birkenau, where an estimated 1.1 million people were murdered during the Second World War and which was inscribed as a World Heritage Site in 1979 as a universal and enduring symbol of unbearable human suffering—as well as the Gothic splendour of Chartres Cathedral, the pantheon of great Europeans, or even the alien Moorish glories of the Alhambra Palace in Granada and the extraordinary *Mesquita* in Cordoba where the ultimate triumph of the Christian *Reconquista* of Spain is viciously underlined by the literal insertion of the cathedral into the very fabric of the Grand Mosque.

> The memorable history of Europeans also embraces pogrom, persecution and prejudice; near continuous internecine war, oppression and genocide. Clearly, the Jewish Holocaust of 1933–45 remains pre-eminent, archetypically 'European' heritage and arguably the most serious heritage challenge facing contemporary European society in managing its past. European Jews—ironically the principal European people not nationally defined—were deported and murdered by Europeans in Europe in pursuit of a European ideology.[36]

The brutalities of this contested and often horrific past still spill over into a contested present and, indeed, have become more complicated as a result of European enlargement. But, again, the past—no matter how awful—can still be seen as constructive if one of the functions of European unity is to prevent its re-occurrence. Thus, it can be argued, Europe's camps, graves, battlefields and memorials must constitute part of its heri-

---

[34] Michael Heffernan, 'For Ever England: The Western Front and the Politics of Remembrance in Britain', *Ecumene* 2 (1995) 293–324.

[35] Paul Gough, 'Commemoration of War', in Graham and Howard, *Ashgate Research Companion*, 225.

[36] Gregory J. Ashworth and Brian J. Graham, 'Heritage, Identity and Europe', *Heritage, Identity and Europe: Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 88.4 (1997) 385.

tage alongside the more acceptable icons that support our ethnocentric notions of European cultural hegemony and civilization.

Moving on from the content of a European heritage leads to the final question as to who can create and manage a European heritage? The European institution with the longest and deepest involvement in the heritage of the built and natural environments is not, as might be imagined, the EU but, instead, the Council of Europe. This comprises forty-seven countries—essentially the totality of Europe—and has developed a whole series of initiatives focused on built and natural cultural heritage. In 1987, for example, it launched a cultural routes programme designed to celebrate the unity and diversity of European identity. In collaboration with the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Council of Europe established the European Institute of Cultural Routes in 1997 which is now responsible for this element to its cultural activities. The first of these itineraries was the pilgrim route—the *Camino*—to Santiago de Compostela, selected because its medieval predecessor connected the remotest north-western corner of Galicia to all of Europe. On the strength of this, the Council was able to declare that the *Camino de Santiago*—lacking any apparent connotations of dissonance and contestation—symbolized attentiveness to others and a 'deeply felt commitment to the European experience'.[37] Since this designation, the number of people walking the *Camino* has escalated markedly, accompanied by a burgeoning infrastructure of way-marked paths and accommodation. It is noticeable, however, that while there are numerous stakeholders—the Spanish state, the regional governments of Navarra, Castile y Léon and Galicia, the Catholic Church and the individual 'pilgrims'—and, consequently, a multiplicity of sometimes conflicting motivations, there is no overt or even implicit iconography or sense of a shared Europeanness in the *Camino*.

The most prominent EU initiative is probably the 'European City/Capital of Culture' designation (the terminology changed from the former to the latter in 1999). Conceived ostensibly to bring people together, this scheme has been prominent in obtaining funds for cultural and tourism initiatives at the local city scale, although, again, the meaning of the 'European' in the title remains vague and largely unexpressed. Success or otherwise seems largely to be calculated at that local scale, it being claimed,

---

[37] Council of Europe, *The Santiago de Compostela Pilgrimage Route* (Strasbourg, 1989); Brian Graham and Michael Murray, 'The Spiritual and the Profane: The Pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela', *Ecumene* 4 (1997) 389–409.

for example, that some 214 million euros in tourism income was generated by Liverpool's designation as 2008 European Capital of Culture.[38] Otherwise, heritage and identity still remain largely the preserve of national and even regional governments, which underscores the inferior position of a European level of identity.

Conclusion: Unity in Diversity?

The EU motto, 'Unity in diversity', superficially chimes with the idea of a cosmopolitan world in which all are equal and everyone is different. It can be argued, however, that the achievement of a cosmopolitan ideology requires an acceptance of the social and political as well as economic legitimacy of the EU, together with redress of the democratic deficit. The tools to achieve such a goal, which include heritage, are, however, weak. Beck calls for the recovery of an authentically European tradition of openness and tolerance to others. Even accepting the validity of such an authenticity, there are profound problems in articulating a multicultural or plural heritage because 'words such as "heritage" and its cognate, "identity", must nearly always be pluralized'.[39] In other words, if it is accepted that heritage is a communicative practice, its messages are multi-vocal:

> relayed simultaneously from many sources, both public/official and private/unofficial, and at many scales. While there are clearly authorized discourses of heritage in societies, the messages being transmitted are likely to be interpreted in numerous diverse ways, not least because of the very plurality of those societies. Indeed, this factor ensures that many heritage messages are not received at all. Thus it is no more likely that 'progressive' pluralist narratives will be received more effectively than are regressive accounts of ethnic and racial differences.[40]

Freud wrote of the 'narcissism of minor differences' that allows people to bind together so long as there are others to act as the recipients of their aggression and, in many ways, Europe's material heritages function precisely in this way.[41] They are articulated and defined in partisan national and regional contexts and governed by national laws for reasons of

---

[38] Patrick Wintour, 'In Liverpool's Footsteps: Now Every City Can Aim to Be Britain's Capital of Culture', *Guardian*, 7 January 2009, 11.

[39] Gregory J. Ashworth, Brian J. Graham and John E. Tunbridge, *Pluralizing Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies* (London, 2008) 207.

[40] Ashworth, Graham, and Tunbridge, *Pluralizing Pasts*, 207.

[41] Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, ed. and trans. James Strachey (New York, 1989) 305.

identity and economy. Moreover, they are often elitist and thus not a particularly efficient medium of communication. Like all markers of similarities and differences, heritage excludes just as it includes but also contains the potential for resistance. Smith argues that the 'Authorized Heritage Discourse' 'works not only to frame heritage debate and practices, but is also itself a discourse that creates and legitimizes a range of identities and social and cultural values'.[42] But, in turn, 'the ways [heritage visitors] interact, engage with and experience heritage may not only challenge the Authorized Heritage Discourse and the assumptions underlying it, but may provide researchers with new ways of understanding and engaging with heritage'.[43]

Moreover, the means of communication have been revolutionized. As Paul Gough argues, 'The public space that once housed the reverential monuments of the twentieth century has become fragmented, serialized and digitally accessible as a consequence of the rapid expansion of communications technologies and digital cultures.'[44] Indeed, the internet may offer a more productive virtual means of creating a European heritage than that offered by attempts to reconcile the continent's national heritages with each other. In November 2008, for example, the EU launched www.europeana.eu, a project to digitize millions of artworks, books and other forms of archival material, described by José Manuel Barroso as a 'Renaissance moment'.[45]

Do these more optimistic ideas of challenge and communications technology help in reconciling European heritage with Beck's vision of a cosmopolitan Europe? It is apparent that unavoidable dissonance exists between the various but simultaneously present scales, meanings and interpretations of heritage throughout Europe and that, within this heterogeneity of meaning and motivation, the idea of a European heritage is poorly developed. But given the fragmentation of territoriality and sovereignty that is characteristic of the New Europe, it is important not to equate the creation of a European heritage with an all-encompassing, pervasive European identity. Rather, as the *Camino de Santiago* demonstrates, the function of a European heritage is to create a European

---

[42] Laurajane Smith, 'Heritage, Gender and Identity', in Graham and Howard, *Ashgate Research Companion*, 173.

[43] Smith, 'Heritage, Gender and Identity', 173.

[44] Gough, 'Commemoration of War', 226.

[45] Angelique Chrisafis, 'Dante to Dialects: EU's Online Renaissance', *Guardian*, 21 November 2008, 29.

dimension that can be added to already complex layers of interpretation. It might embrace common principles such as the struggle for democratic and civil rights and the attendant sites of war and atrocity, common principles that can then be related to the specific differences of nation and region. Above all, therefore, a European heritage must be manipulated as a mosaic of similarity but also of the differences that reflect the reality that Europe's heritage comprises a whole succession of national, regional and local heritages. But the problem is more complex than that alone because the reality is that Europe is cosmopolitan in its ethnic and cultural human heterogeneity yet the situation of many of its inhabitants is summed up in the phrase: 'we are here, yet we are not here'.[46]

A European identity cannot comprise that which is common to all: 'this would result merely in an anaemic and sanitized heritage in which the hard questions posed by the past are obscured by superficial narratives of progression and European cultural hegemony'.[47] A European heritage can mean 'the heritages of Europe' and has to go beyond the rhetoric of 'celebrating' diversity to portray dissonance, difference and contestation as positive qualities, symbolic of the reality—to draw an analogy with Canada—that there is no one landscape or iconography that can encompass Europe's diversity. That, in turn, would mesh with Beck's *mélange* principle, a heritage which, to reiterate, would 'interpenetrate, interconnect and intermingle'.

The reality in Europe is, however, very much the opposite. As Katharyne Mitchell has argued, a period of assimilationist ideology of immigrant absorption into the host society up to the mid-1960s was followed by a 'differentialist turn' reflected in state-sponsored multicultural programmes. Since the mid-1990s—and especially since 2001—there has been a return to assimilation, the active achievement of diversity being abandoned in favour of a neo-liberal separation of public and private (an adjunct to the ideology of 'choice') and the 'return' of nationalism and its 'right' to exclude.[48] The concomitant resurgence of the national state, national heritage and nationalist criteria of belonging as the prime means of subsuming diversity bode ill for cosmopolitanism. It is much easier to suborn Europe's heritage to this essentially regressive goal than to the celebration of the unity in diversity. In terms of the three questions

---

[46] Buciek and Juul, ' "We Are Here Yet We Are Not Here": The Heritage of Excluded Groups.'
[47] Ashworth and Graham, 'Heritage, Identity and Europe', 387.
[48] Mitchell, 'Geographies of Identity: Multiculturalism Unplugged.'

underlying this discussion, there is a clear need for a European heritage, not merely for economic reasons but to underpin the legitimacy of the European project. The content of that heritage, however, remains debatable, less because of the extent of the tangible and intangible wealth of Europe's heritages than the strength of the European messages that can be attached to them. National, regional and even local voices are almost always more powerful, not least because those are the scales at which heritage is defined and managed. The weakness of the idea of Europe is reflected in the limitations of the heritage of Europeanization and Euopeanness. Diversity is simultaneously a positive and a negative force. Permeable European boundaries have removed some of the differences between places but identity and its marker, heritage, still seem largely to focus inwards along axes of inclusion and exclusion. Merely adding a European message to heritage is not in itself sufficient to diminish the lack of legitimation accorded the European project and, in turn, push towards the idealistic goal of a cosmopolitan Europe.

CONTEMPORARY ART AND THE CONCEPT OF ART HISTORY: INFLUENCE, DEPENDENCY AND CHALLENGE

Peter J. Schneemann

Introduction

Any discussion of the relationship between contemporary art and art history has to state and stress the obvious: there exists a strong interrelation between the two of them. Since the historiography and the production of art have lately strengthened their relationship, a clarification of these interactions seems to be necessary. Until recently, generations of university professors have been convinced that contemporary art should not be a field of investigation for an art historian; it was argued that the lack of historical distance could not allow the development of a critical narrative.[1] Already in the eighteenth century the birth of a public audience had given the critical beholder an authoritative position that could claim autonomy. As part of the humanities, art history was able to develop historiographical and hermeneutical reference systems that claimed independence from the individual intention of the artist.

It was probably no coincidence that in the 1970s art history participated in the debate about the authority of the beholder, which was closely linked to the proclamation of the death of the author.[2] The discipline considered its task as that of re-establishing the historiographical context for a work of art, for example by determining its position in a stylistic sequence after having isolated it from the social context and conditions of its production and reception. Art history thus defined itself as a discipline that would direct its hermeneutical instruments exclusively towards the aesthetic object.[3]

---

[1] Regarding the dispute around the PhD project William Seitz announced to Yale in 1950 see Garnett McCoy, 'A Continued Story: Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Princeton University, and William C. Seitz', *Archives of American Art Journal* 21.3 (1981) 8–13.

[2] Christian Bracht, *Kunstkommentare der sechziger Jahre: Funktionen und Fundierungsprogramm* (Weimar, 2002).

[3] Wolfgang Kemp, 'Kontexte: Für eine Kunstgeschichte der Komplexität', *Texte zur Kunst* 2 (1991) 89–101.

Both Hans Belting and Arthur C. Danto wrote in the mid-1980s about the 'end of art history' and the 'end of art', respectively, and diagnosed a historiographical problem of both art and art history. Belting's provocative proclamation of the 'end of art history'—notably, in his revised edition of 1995, he dropped the question mark which he had included in his initial version of 1983—has challenged traditional historiography and has questioned the position of contemporary art towards art history as discipline.[4] His argument is founded on the conviction that the art-historical 'frame' has become insufficient to describe modern or postmodern art. While his demand for art historians to concern themselves with the contemporary ('Zeitgenossenschaft') went mostly unheeded at the time, the term has recently received great attention amongst art historians and has been the subject of many publications and conferences.[5]

In the past decades, art history has also distinguished itself as a player in the contemporary art scene, which has become an extremely fashionable and popular field of study. An increasing number of art history departments have set up positions devoted to contemporary art. Most of these scholars work closely together with the artistic community, art dealers and curators. This proximity is perceived as an attractive offer to students who see their future in a curatorial position or in working for a commercial gallery. The development in Europe follows a trend that could be observed in the United States a few years earlier. According to the College Art Association's guide to PhD programmes in art history in 1984, only three faculty members among forty-seven US doctoral programmes were listed with specialties in contemporary art and only one listed art

---

[4] Hans Belting, *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte?* (Munich, 1984); Belting, *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte: Eine Revision nach zehn Jahren* (Munich, 1995); Arthur Danto, *After the End of Art* (Princeton, NJ, 1997); see also Stefan Germer, 'Mit den Augen des Kartographen—Navigationshilfen im Posthistoire', in *Kunst ohne Geschichte? Ansichten zu Kunst und Kunstgeschichte heute*, ed., Anne-Marie Bonnet and Gabriele Kopp-Schmidt (Munich, 1995) 140–51.

[5] Bonnet and Kopp-Schmidt, *Kunst ohne Geschichte?*; see also Peter J. Schneemann, 'Nähe und Distanz als Herausforderung einer Kunstgeschichte der Gegenwart: Fragen zum Konzept einer erweiterten Dokumentation', in *Visions of a Future: Art and Art History in Changing Contexts*, ed. Hans-Jorg Heusser and Kornelia Imesch (Zürich, 2004) 293–306; 'Zeitgenossenschaft' was the title of the conference of the German Association of Art Historians in Bonn 2004; Verena Krieger, ed., *Kunstgeschichte & Gegenwartskunst: Vom Nutzen & Nachteil der Zeitgenossenschaft* (Cologne, 2008); Wolfgang Brückle and Rachel Mader, 'Zeitgenossenschaft', *kritische berichte: Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften* 35.3 (2007), 7–11; Terry Smith, 'The State of Art History: Contemporary Art', *Art Bulletin* 92.3 (2010), 366–83.

since 1945 as their sole specialty. In the 1995 guide, of the fifty-five doctoral programmes listed, sixteen were contemporary positions; in the revised edition of 1999 there were twenty.[6] As a consequence, the methodological challenges were discussed more thoroughly. Issues of involvement, critical distance, and responsibility were raised.

A twofold observation can be made of the interrelation between contemporary art and art history. On the one hand, the long established distinction between the functions of art criticism and the establishment of a historiographic narrative no longer seems feasible. The differences between the artistic text, the gallery text and the art-historical essay have become blurred. Indeed, the artist has come to challenge and test the domain of the art historian. On the other hand, art historians dealing with contemporary art are, surprisingly, by no means the most progressive; the opportunity to analyse a work in the context of a complex field of social production and to benefit from the fact of contemporaneity is rarely taken advantage of. Indeed, studies in other areas, such as the Middle Ages or the eighteenth century have often been more innovative than the monographic studies of contemporary art. In light of these observations, the role both of contemporary art production and of the art historian who constitutes the reality of a work of art, shapes its perception and also debates its value, are in urgent need of re-evaluation.[7]

This chapter aims to discuss the mutual interests of the artist and the art historian and to point out the role of contemporary art in the conception of art history. What happens to the artist as historiographer, and in which ways is it possible to describe their mutual influence? Evidently, these questions are not limited to a European perspective. Nevertheless, the historiographic models that inform contemporary artists and which the artistic practice investigates are based on the European concept of art.[8] When contemporary art claims to be global and our discipline tries to adapt its perspective accordingly, new questions come to the fore.

---

[6] See www.collegeart.org information provided by Howard Singerman. For the situation in Europe see Sibylle Omlin, *Kunst aus der Schweiz: Kunstschaffen und Kunstsystem im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Zürich, 2002) 146–7.

[7] See Philip Ursprung's notion of performative art history: 'Performative Kunstgeschichte', in *Kunstgeschichte & Gegenwartskunst: Vom Nutzen & Nachteil der Zeitgenossenschaft*, ed. Verena Krieger (Cologne, 2007) 213–26.

[8] See Mitchell Schwarzer, 'Origins of the Art History Survey Text', *Art Journal* 3 (1995) 24–9.

The Artist as Art Historian

One of the most important starting points for understanding the reciprocal involvement of art production and art history might be found in the education of the artists. In Europe there has been a long tradition of curricula that link the creative process to a historiographic consciousness. Even in the nineteenth century, students of an academy knew the line of tradition they were expected to continue and develop further. When the winner of the Prix de Rome received his medal in the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, he did so in front of the congregation of the great masters painted on the *Hemicycle* by Paul Delaroche. By means of copying the achievements of a glorious past the artist was able to adopt the potentials of the last generation. Within the avant-garde this model was far from being dismissed; rather, it was continued in a dialectical negation.[9] The iconoclastic turning against the past was based on a clear concept and knowledge of the system. The idea of progress and the imperative of the new did not lose their power.[10] The examination of the paradigms of art history shifted towards the more abstractly conceptual. A philosophical or art-historical training was fostered to liberate the education of the artist from the model of influence and the mimicry of styles.

Especially in America in the 1950s, the artist who chose the academic path was trained together with the art historian and learned to write art-historical essays on European modernity.[11] Art history, one of the foundations in the curriculum of the old academies and the discussions of theoretical concepts became important again for the education of artists in the post-Bauhaus era. When artists such as Robert Motherwell, Barnett Newman or Allan Kaprow studied art history and established an intense exchange of ideas with their teacher, Meyer Schapiro, the consequences were manifold. One might indicate three levels, although they are hard to differentiate and closely related: first, they reflected on the position of their work with regard to existing traditions; second, their artistic projects

---

[9] Astrit Schmidt-Burkhardt, *Stammbäume der Kunst: Zur Genealogie der Avantgarde* (Berlin, 2005).

[10] As Boris Groys states, 'The individual striving for the new, and the social orientation towards the new, and the constant production of the new will continue to persist.' Boris Groys, *Über das Neue: Versuch einer Kulturökonomie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1999) 9. See, too, Suzi Gablik, *Progress in Art* (London, 1984).

[11] Howard Singerman, *Art Subjects: Making Artists in the American University* (Berkeley, CA, 1999).

developed into historiographic projects, and, thirdly, their self- documentations served as their own integration into art history.

It is necessary to understand the importance of this historical consciousness for the artist within the constellation of art history and art production. The Abstract Expressionists gave crucial value to the historiographic model. This is mirrored in their discussion of key concepts, such as 'beauty' or the 'sublime', which they took as starting points to position themselves as protagonists in the development of modern art.[12] Robert Motherwell was eager to spread the sources of European thought by publishing a series devoted to 'documents.' As the editor of the 'Documents of Modern Art' (later renamed the 'Documents of Twentieth-century Art'), a series of writings by European artists in English translation, he initiated a project that intended to demonstrate how artists themselves were involved in historicizing their own movement. The 'Prospectus for the Documents of Modern Art' announces that:

> The series, called 'The Documents of Modern Art' is aimed mainly at young artists and students who need their material in English.... By documents is meant first-hand material; the texts are restricted to writings by artists themselves, or by their friends and associates.... The series is limited to the great established artists and movements of the period from the turn of the century to the present; its director is Robert Motherwell, a young modern painter.[13]

This level of intellectual exchange was promoted by a European artist in America who called for a university degree for artists. In a lecture held in 1960, Marcel Duchamp raised the question whether the university was a necessity for the artist—'should the artist go to university?'—and answered it in the affirmative. Duchamp saw the artist not as an inferior worker, but as a free man ('un homme libre') who was fully integrated into society and no longer dependent on authorities, such as clients. This new liberation, however, entailed certain 'responsibilities, one of the most important being *education* of the intellect, even though, professionally,

---

[12] Barnett Newman, 'The Sublime is Now', article for *Tiger's-Eye* (December, 1948) in *Barnett Newman: Selected Writings and Interviews*, ed. John P. O'Neill (New York, 1990) 170–3.

[13] Motherwell expresses the aim of his work as follows: 'Ultimately I should like to see in print in good English translation every major document in relation to modern art— fauvism, cubism, de Stijl, expressionism, futurism, dada, constructivism, ... of twentieth-century art ... to render unnecessary reading of secondary writings about contemporary art', in *The Collected Writings of Robert Motherwell*, ed. Stephanie Terenzio (Los Angeles, 1999) 293.

the intellect is not the basis for the education of artistic genius.'[14] In order to be equal to other professions, the artist needs to receive a similar academic education—even more so, since the artist accomplishes a quasi-religious mission, that is, of 'maintaining the flame of an interior vision of which the work of art is the most faithful translation for the profane world'.[15] The highest degree of education is thus considered as indispensable.

In line with Duchamp's notion, universities and institutions such as the *Institut des Hautes Etudes en Arts Plastiques de Paris* increasingly began to reflect upon the significance of the artist's education. The school's unconventional and experimental character presents a special case in the European art educational context and might explain why it closed after only eight years in 1995. The aim of the institute, according to the initiator Pontus Hultén, was not to teach art but to give a chosen number of students the chance to meet other students and discuss their works of art, to exchange knowledge and talk about art-historical subjects. The circle was extended to lawyers, scientists and others with whom the artists might come into contact in their future careers. Students were engaged in discussions about their attitudes towards art history, the studio, and theory of art. For Hultén and Sarkis the knowledge of art history is essential for the artist, since without it he would not be able to work. When discussing *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* in November 1988, one of the students proclaimed that 'undertaking a renewed analysis of *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* is an interesting task, but is of no relevance for self-questioning creative artists about to enter the domain of art', which was countered by Sarkis with the question whether 'only art historians examine such documents and not artists?'[16] The organizers thus wanted the art students to deal with outstanding works of art and to consider their own position in relation to these pieces and their art-historical genealogy.[17]

---

[14] Marcel Duchamp, 'L'artiste doit-il aller à l'université?' Lecture held at the symposium *Should the Artist go to College?* at the Hofstra College in Hempstead (Long Island, NY) in 1960, in *Duchamp du signe. Ecrits*, ed. Michel Sanouillet (Paris, 1975) 236–9.

[15] Duchamp in Sanouillet, ed., *Duchamp du signe*, 236–9.

[16] The sessions were documented in the form of protocols, of which those from 1988 to 1992 were published in two volumes. Marie-Sophie Boulan, ed., *Quand les artistes font école. Vingt-quatre journées de l'Institut des hautes etudes en arts plastiques*, 2 vols. (Marseille and Paris, 2004), session quoted: 'Le Territoire de l'art comme refuge', 29 November 1988, 127–48.

[17] Thierry Dufrêne, 'Das Institut des Hautes Etudes en arts plastiques de Paris (1988–1995)': eine Utopie ohne Zukunft? in *Kunstausbildung: Aneignung und Vermittlung künstlerischer Kompetenz*, ed. Peter J. Schneeman and Wolfgang Brückle (Munich, 2008) 21–34.

With the introduction of the practice-based PhD, the concept of the educated artist has recently reached a new level.[18] The new term at art academies is 'artistic research', which alludes to the artist as researcher, who not only produces art but writes about it and studies artistic strategies and methods.[19] Goldsmiths College at the University of London, for example, offers programmes leading to a PhD for practising artists who increasingly define their work as 'research'.[20] They obtain an academic degree that tries to adapt the vocabulary of scholarship while at the same time it serves to redefine research beyond the traditional paradigm of expert 'knowledge' by exploring notions of experience-based knowing. Simultaneously, artistic researchers increasingly attempt to collaborate with other scientific fields, thereby embracing interdisciplinary approaches in which knowledge is shared between artists, art historians and scholars from other domains. Artists with an academic background have thus started to operate with art-historical categories in multi-layered ways that challenge the art historian. Indeed, contemporary artists present a new competence that tests and rejects the art historian's faculty.

The link between the documented self-definition of artists and art-historical discourse can be retraced in the way artists have reacted against the historiography of their works and in the way art historians have used artists' papers and documents. One basic difficulty lies in the fact that contemporary statements and historiographical analysis are hard to separate. The discourse of production and the discourse of historical analysis are closely interwoven. Art historians have been tempted to use the artist's word as part of their historiography. This becomes especially problematic in the interview. Often, contemporary artists give clear instructions

[18] See for example Stefan Römer, who holds a PhD and is an art historian and an artist. Stefan Römer, *Künstlerische Strategien des Fake: Kritik von Original und Fälschung* (Cologne, 2001).

[19] Sarah Schmidt, 'Künstlerische Forschung', *kritische berichte: Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften* 35.3 (2007) 50–3; Dieter Lesage, 'The Academy is Back: On Education, the Bologna Process, and the Doctorate in the Arts', http://e-flux.com/journal/view/45 (accessed 14 September 2010); see also Jesus R. Soto, 'The Role of Scientific Concepts in Art', *Leonardo*, *Art and Science: Similarities, Differences and Interactions*, special issue 27 (1994) 227–30.

[20] For critical analyses of the practice-based PhD see James Elkins, ed., *Artists with PhDs: On the New Doctoral Degree in Studio Art* (Washington, 2009) and Annette W. Balkema and Henk Slager, eds., *Artistic Research* (Amsterdam and New York, 2004). See too the exhibition *Nameless Science*, curated by Henk Slager (10 December 2008–31 January 2009, at apex New York).

and key words for their own works in their interviews, which are happily repeated by the art historian. Instead of taking the artist's interview as a form which needs to be interpreted and put in a contextual frame just as the work does, art historians frequently are little more than a mouthpiece of the artist, or try at least to support their own analysis with the help of information the artist provides.[21] What is more, many artists no longer wish to leave the business of contextualizing to the art historian. Artists like Joseph Kosuth still fight against the consequences of an approach which tries to incapacitate the artist intellectually. They quarrel with the fact that the artist's comment is devalued by art history in favour of the interpretative act that begins with the work.

> The artists are in danger. . . . It seems quite unavoidable to not conclude that there isn't a malaise of deep conservatism which pervades the art histori-cal and critical establishment, in which some kind of cliché of convention necessitate a view of artists as mongoloid children playing with lumps of clay, in dire need of the paternal art historical and critical presence to swoop down and make sense of it all.[22]

Kosuth's comment clearly expresses the ambition of artistic 'emancipa-tion' from art historians and critics in the sense of the desire for stronger artistic control of the historiography of art.

   Appropriation, institutional critique and the broader self-awareness of postmodernism have raised the interrelation between art-historical narra-tives and artistic production to a new level. The confident contemporary artist has begun to cite art history and to take part in the historiographic contextualization of his or her own work. Indeed, as Stefan Germer has observed, since the 1960s and 1970s this has also become a trademark of approaches by non-western artists toward the European tradition. Contemporary artists study the work of those artists they find 'useful'.[23]

---

21 Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, 'Über die Avantgarde—1986: Interview mit Gerhard Richter', *Gerhard Richter*, exhibition catalogue, ed. Kaspar König (Stuttgart, 1993) 81–96. See, too, Julia Gelshorn, 'Der Künstler spricht: Vom Umgang mit den Texten Gerhard Richters', in *Legitimationen. Künstlerinnen und Künstler als Autoritäten der Gegenwartskunst*, ed. Julia Gelshorn (Bern, 2005) 127–48; Christoph Lichtin, *Das Künstlerinterview: Analyse eines Kun-stprodukts* (Bern, 2004).

22 Joseph Kosuth, 'Über das Spiel des Unsagbaren und des Unerwähnbaren', *Kunstfo-rum International* 125 (1994) 67, quoted from the original manuscript by Kosuth, 'Writing, Curating and the Play of Art', provided by his studio. See also Joseph Kosuth and Seth Siegelaub, 'Reply to Benjamin Buchloh on Conceptual Art', *October* 57 (1991) 152–7.

23 Stefan Germer, 'Die schwierigen Zeitgenossen: Über die Probleme der Historisierung aktueller Kunst', in *Germeriana: Unveröffentlichte oder übersetzte Schriften von Stefan Germer zur zeitgenössischen und modernen Kunst*, ed. Jutta Bernard (Cologne, 1999) 219–32.

Such diverse figures as Marina Abramović, John Baldessari, Ilya Kabakov, Gerhard Richter, Mark Tansey and Heimo Zobernig all share as a practice the analytical deployment of art-historical categories, rhetorics, norms and instruments, which they understand as a reference system, the ideological implications of which they then deconstruct. It is in keeping with this trend that art historians serve as assistants or collaborators with artists.[24] As a consequence, works of art have become more and more a product of art history, which does not suggest a notion of artistic tradition but rather a practice that is the outcome of an art-historical approach: in other words, its methods, rhetorics and gestures. This has even led to a shift in the self-definition of artists—a figure such as Sherrie Levine has avoided the conventional profile of the creative artist.[25]

Closed Systems: Contemporary Art and the Conception of Art History

Art history has to take this informed artistic practice very seriously, since it must be understood as an analytical one. Academic art history developed a range of discourses and theories, such as institutional critique, gender theory, a concern with hybridity and alterity which emerged in response to developments in artistic strategy. Consequently, our discipline is left with describing a radical gesture which has turned the institutions of art history—the museum, library or archive—into artistic projects. Finally, the formats of our discipline, like the catalogue raisonné or even the guided tour, have been taken over by artists themselves and have been deconstructed as systems of meaning ('Bedeutungssysteme').[26] Very much in the sense of a repeated gesture of authorization, which confirms his or her sovereignty towards art history, historiographical discourses and critical reception, the artist has become increasingly involved in the creation of his or her own catalogue raisonné. The frequent cooperation and interaction between the art historian's specifications and artistic motivation

---

[24] The art historian Hubertus Butin, for example, worked as an assistant to Gerhard Richter for two years, and the art historians Anette Lagler and Walter Grasskamp assisted Hans Haacke with his installation *Germania* at the German pavilion at the Venice Biennale in 1993. See Klaus Bussmann and Florian Matzner, eds., *Hans Haacke: Bodenlos* (Stuttgart, 1993) 18.

[25] Howard Singerman, 'Sherrie Levine's Art History', *October* 101 (2002) 96–121.

[26] See for example Andrea Fraser's, *Museum Highlights: A Gallery Talk* of 1989, in which she acts as the museum guide Jane Castleton; Andrea Fraser, *Works: 1984 to 2003*, ed. Yilmaz Dziewior (Cologne, 2003) 114. On this phenomenon see Sabine Kampmann, *Künstler sein: Systemtheoretische Beobachtungen von Autorschaft* (Munich, 2006) 102.

may appear as ideal as they are problematic. In the contemporary art system the pattern of traditional roles has also been suspended.[27] The old reference system that told the story of creation and reception, of intention and interpretation as sequential steps, clearly separated the activities and responsibilities of the artist and the art historian. Curating, displaying, archiving and the development of a canonical narrative were unambiguously assigned to the latter. This constellation has been investigated and questioned by artistic practice; now it is fractured.

The Austrian artist Heimo Zobernig designed in his 2003 exhibition at the Stiftung Ludwig Museum of Modern Art in Vienna the cover of the exhibition catalogue, as he had for many of his previous exhibitions.[28] The eye-catching title *Heimo Zobernig. Austelung Katerlog* startles the reader because of its misspelling (the correct German would read: 'Ausstellungskatalog'). The artist's deliberate misspellings may serve to question the catalogue as a system of meanings ('Bedeutungssystem') and to deconstruct it. The catalogue is no longer exclusive to the discipline of the art historian, but is also subject to the artist's appropriation. Zobernig's statement that he is not an artist but a scientist and historian further underline the artist's self-conception.[29] He is involved in the discipline of art history and influences the art-historical narrative of his work. His dictum 'Classify, determine the place of things and concepts in their isolated form, and show their connections' reveals his preference for classification systems which, in his work, relate to letters, numbers and geometrical forms, and finds its application more generally in scientific areas.[30] In *Lexikon der Kunst 1992* ('Art Lexicon 1992'), which takes the form of an ordinary dictionary, Zobernig gathers names and terms that are taken from or refer to the contemporary art context and lists them in alphabetical order. His subjective choices reflect his own perception of the art system ('Kunstbetrieb').[31] In so doing, he functions as an art historian of his own work.

---

[27] Peter J. Schneemann, 'Eigennutz. Das Interesse von Künstlern am Werkkatalog', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte* 62 (2005) 217–24.

[28] Heimo Zobernig, *Heimo Zobernig: Austelung Katerlog* (Cologne, 2003).

[29] Jan Winkelmann, 'Intuitive Formalismen', in *Kunst und Text, Heimo Zobernig*, eds. Annelie Pohlen and Heimo Zobernig (Leipzig, 1998) 31–6. See, too, Kunstverein Ruhr, ed., *Heimo Zobernig* (Essen, 2003); Neues Museum Weserburg Bremen, ed., *MINIMAL MAXIMAL: Die Minimal Art und ihr Einfluss auf die Kunst der 90er Jahre* (Heidelberg, 1998).

[30] 'Ordnen, die Orte der Dinge und die der Begriffe in ihrer isolierten Form bestimmen und ihre Verbindungen zeigen', in Winkelmann, 'Intuitive Formalismen', 34.

[31] See the special issue of *Kunstforum International* 125 (1994) edited by Thomas Wulffen on 'Betriebssystem Kunst'—eine Retrospektive.

The critical and political potential of the artistic appropriation of an art-historical method becomes evident in the work by the German artist Hans Haacke. In *Manet Project '74*, executed for the 150th anniversary of the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum in Cologne, he disclosed the network of the international art trade by researching the ownership of Manet's painting *Bunch of Asparagus* over roughly the previous ninety years. This simple art-historical analysis led to a political debate and even a public scandal. In the context of similar interventions the artist together with his collaborating art historians documented the public discourse which emerged as a constitutive element of his oeuvre.[32]

Such artistic interventions in the field of art history show that the discipline needs to reconsider its methodological assumptions. It can no longer study an object in aesthetic isolation. Instead, the context, the artist's interview, his or her texts and the art-historical reception of the work need to be included and seen as part of its history.[33] This also requires an attempt to understand a work in relation to other works and its position within a relational system (network). As Germer has stated, 'When we speak about the multiplicity of signs, the limitlessness of contexts and the changing locations of the production of meaning, we describe the basic possibilities which are inherent in a work.'[34]

As the artists' group 'Cercle Ramo Nash', founded in Nice in 1987, demonstrates with its *Black Box*, it becomes increasingly problematic to describe the intrinsic aesthetic value of a work of art. The black steel work was exhibited in the 'white cube' of the Parisian gallery Chantal Crousel for the first time in 1998, where it presented itself as a hermetic box that could not be entered.[35] Moreover, one of the central reference points of the art system was lacking, since the artists' collective remains anonymous and refuses to take on an artistic individuality as author. A drawing of 1993 shows the diagram representing *Black Box* as an interface in the

---

[32] On the *Manet-Projekt, '74* see Jack Burnham, Howard S. Becker and John Walton, *Hans Haacke: Framing and Being Framed* (Halifax and New York, 1975). For the status of the public discussion see also Michael Diers and Kasper König, eds., *Aufsätze und Dokumente zur Debatte um das Reichstagsprojekt von Hans Haacke 'Der Bevölkerung'* (Cologne, 2000).

[33] Germer in Bernard, *Germeriana*, 230; see also Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* (Dijon-Quetigny, 2006).

[34] Germer in Bernard, *Germeriana*, 231–2; see also Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, 'Conceptual Art 1962–1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions', *October* 55 (1990) 105–43.

[35] On the 'white cube' see Brian O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space,* rev. ed. (Los Angeles, 1986; exp. edn. 1999).

contemporary art scene: artists, critics, collectors and the media as factors which circle around the work; critical awareness, intuition, memory and participation as artistic processes. Most importantly, Cercle Ramo Nash's *Black Box* addresses the meaning that discourse projects on the hermetic and auratic work, which is isolated in the institutional frame of the gallery or the museum. While Ad Reinhardt, colleague and friend of Tony Smith, produced diagrams like these in order to illustrate the dangerous dependencies of art, they now demonstrate a central artistic examination of production and reception processes in which the white cube and *Black Box* are included as models. *Black Box* encloses a computer which processes the discourse about a work. By means of external terminals, questions can be addressed to *Sowana, generator of specific problems*. It remains unclear whether there is an artist inside the box who answers the questions, or whether our own discourse is sent back in fractured pieces.[36]

Black Box played with the dichotomy between the status of the black box as a sculptural phenomenon in the tradition of modernist phenomenology and discourse as the social reality that surrounds or even constitutes a work of art.[37] When Tino Sehgal represented Germany at the Biennale in Venice in 2005, his work, constituted by the moment of communicative interaction, challenged the traditional notion of the work as an aesthetic object as represented by Thomas Scheibitz, the sculptor who also represented Germany at the Biennale. The interactions developed by the trained economist Sehgal circle around topics like economic processes, development and sustainability with all their ambiguities; he also explores alternative strategies of art production. As Sehgal has stated, 'The reason I'm interested in the transformation of actions and the simultaneity of production and reproduction is because I think that the appearance in Western societies in the twentieth century of both an excess supply of the goods that fulfil basic human needs and mankind's endangering of the specific disposition of "nature" in which human life seems possible renders the hegemony of the dominant mode of production questionable.'[38] Sehgal is extremely careful not to work with traditional materials in order to prevent any traces of his performative acts and even refuses to grant

---

[36] *Premises: Invested Spaces in Visual Arts, Architecture, & Design from France: 1958–1998*, exhibition catalogue, Guggenheim Museum SoHo (New York, 1998) 312–15.

[37] Georges Didi-Huberman, *Ce que nous voyons, ce qui nous regarde* (Paris, 1992).

[38] Tino Sehgal in Tim Griffin, 'Tino Sehgal. An Interview', *Artforum International* 43 (2005) 218.

permission to take photographs.[39] We are confronted with the aim to give contemporary art political relevance again and to include the audience in a discourse that discusses actual problems. This goes against the conventional line of thinking, which increasingly conceives the contemporary art system as a closed system.

The problematic limitation of the old concept that described the art work as a purely self-referential gesture repeats itself in this issue of closed social interaction. The art historian, as a protagonist and 'prisoner' in this closed system, is challenged in his or her critical judgment. 'The "contemporary art" juggernaut operates primarily in terms of frameworks— managerial, curatorial, corporate, historical, commercial, educational— imposed by art institutions, themselves a key part of a now pervasive, beguilingly distractive but at bottom hollow cultural industry.'[40] Universities used to promote the interest in contemporary art, but by now its discourse has become anti-academic. Exhibitions, art markets, auctions, collectors and magazines all participate in the discussion of the development of contemporary art and its relevance. The quote by Christian Boros, 'I collect art that I do not understand', shows that the understanding of art is no longer the aim.[41] The hermeneutical approach to the work of art is replaced with a concern for owning and handling, possessing and displacing. [42]

Popular books on art history, a literary genre that has become highly marketable and fills many shelves in bookstores, attest to the newly emerging economic target group. These new handbooks are symptomatic of a further differentiation in which the activity around a work seems to detach itself from the actual work. The art historian has become less important than the art collector or gallery owner.[43] While a few years ago

---

[39] 'There is a technical reason in that a performance is always something that has a specific set format: people meet at a certain time and then there's one set of people who perform for another set of people. This does not have the same temporality as an exhibition. The word 'performance' is linked to certain artists who are ideologically opposed to me because they want to disassociate themselves from museums and the market and romanticize themselves', in Louisa Buck, 'Without a trace. Tino Sehgal interviewed by Louisa Buck', *The Art Newspaper* 167 (2006) 38.

[40] Terry Smith, 'Contemporary Art and Contemporaneity', *Critical Inquiry* 32 (2006) 695.

[41] Christian Boros, 'Ich sammle Kunst, die ich nicht verstehe', in *Sammlung Boros*, http://www.sammlung-boros.de (accessed 14 September 2010).

[42] Oskar Bätschmann, *Einführung in die kunstgeschichtliche Hermeneutik: Die Auslegung von Bildern* (Darmstadt, 1984).

[43] Terry Smith, 'Writing the History of Contemporary Art: A Distinction, three Propositions and six Lines of Inquiry', in *Crossing Cultures, Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, ed. Jaynie Anderson (Melbourne, 2009) 918–21.

the authority to determine the narrative of art history was reserved for curators, it is now the collectors who are regarded as important authorities in the orchestration of the contemporary.[44] The question is not so much whether this threatens art history but whether there is a danger of art history just mirroring itself in this closed system. Art history tends to lose its independence and to paraphrase a controlled discourse instead. The critical distance toward the living artist often disappears, and the art historian, artist and collector form career alliances in the belief that complicity could serve as legitimization.[45] When the artist accepts the ready-made frame art history offers him and art history only searches for illustrations of its own historiographic narrative and hermeneutic gesture, something is wrong. In any case, it becomes evident that processes of rethinking the academic practice of art history have to refer to concepts and strategies of artistic research.[46]

Outlook

A discussion of the relation between contemporary art and the concept of art history that focuses on a European perspective shows clear limitations; contemporary art is a globalized phenomenon, created and marketed not just in European and American centres, but all around the world. While in the middle of the twentieth century American critics declared that the centre of the art world had shifted to New York, today the prevalence of new sites such as Shanghai, Istanbul or Berlin make the notion of a centre altogether obsolete. Yet despite this expansion, contemporary art production, global exhibitions and discourse could be characterized in relation

[44] Peter J. Schneemann, 'Ich bin keine Zielgruppe: Zur Konstellation von Produktions- und Rezeptionstypologien in der Gegenwart', in *Grammatik der Kunstgeschichte: Sprachproblem und Regelwerk im 'Bild-Diskurs'. Oskar Bätschmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hubert Locher and Peter J. Schneemann (Zürich, 2008) 78–89.

[45] Anne-Marie Bonnet, 'Kunstgeschichte Museum Gegenwart', in Krieger, *Kunstgeschichte & Gegenwartskunst*, 185: 'Wendet sich das Fach zeitgenössischer Kunst zu, geschieht dies meist rein affirmativ, und nicht selten schwindet die kritische Distanz zum lebenden Künstler oder es entstehen gar "Karriere-Bündnisse".' See also Philipp Ursprung, 'Performative Kunstgeschichte', in Krieger, ed., *Kunstgeschichte & Gegenwartskunst*, 213–26.

[46] Michael Ann Holly, 'Past Looking', *Critical Inquiry* 16 (1990) 371–96 and 'What is Research in Art History Anyway?' in *Art History on Demand? Dienstleistung Kunstgeschichte?* ed. Oskar Batschmann, Julia Gelshorn, Norberto Gramaccini, Bernd Nicolai, and Peter J. Schneemann (Emsdetten, 2008) 92–8.

to universal norms.[47] It is highly significant, for example, that the contemporary artist frequently rejects a national identity and instead prefers the role of the nomad and claims hybridity.[48]

Haacke, who has been living in New York for forty years, constantly recalls the National Socialist period in works like *Germania*, which he executed for the German pavilion at the Venice Biennale in 1993.[49] Ancestry as well as nationality seem to be a strategy for artistic legitimization and a tool for authenticity in a globalized art world. Marina Abramović, despite the fact that she exemplifies like Haacke the model of the nomad, refers to her East European identity as a permanent resource for artistic interventions such as *Balkan Baroque*. In such dialectical gestures a desire for authenticity emerges.[50] Ilya Kabakov naturally passes for a Russian artist but actually lives in New York and is American. In works such as *The Communal Kitchen* (1991) he reveals cultural issues in everyday Soviet and post-Soviet Russian life.[51] The geographical reference system has become a fictional one, supporting the illusion of a cultural pluralism that in the economic system of a globalized art market no longer exists.

---

[47] Alexander Alberro, 'Periodizing Contemporary Art', in Anderson, ed., *Crossing Cultures*, 935–9.

[48] Birgit Haehnel, *Regelwerk und Umgestaltung: Nomadistische Denkweisen in der Kunstwahrnehmung nach 1945* (Berlin, 2006).

[49] See further works by Haacke such as *Ihr habt doch gesiegt* ('You Were Victorious After All', 1988); *Die Fahne hoch!* ('Raise the Flag', 1991); *Germania* (1993).

[50] David Elliott, 'Balkanische Barock', in *Marina Abramović. Villa Stuck Exhibition Catalogue*, ed. Jo-Ane Virnie Danzker and Chrissie Iles (Munich, 1996) 55-73

[51] On Kabakov see Boris Groys, Iwona Blazwick, Ilya Kabakov, and David Ross, *Ilya Kabakov* (London, 1998).

FORMALISM AND THE HISTORY OF STYLE

Andrea Pinotti

The notion of 'form' in its indeterminacy—meaning both the visible phe-
nomenon and the invisible structure, the image (*eidolon*) and the idea
(*eidos*), opposing itself both to content and to materiality—seems to many
too vague a tool to be useful in aesthetic and art-theoretical discourse. Yet
it is very difficult to give up employing it. Similarly, the concept of 'style' is
a source of deep dissatisfaction in art-historical methodology; nonetheless
art historians persist in using it. Ambiguous both in its connotations—
positively, when a person or a work has style; negatively, when something
is in a style, meaning it is only imitative—and in its denotations—the
style of a single irreducible artist as opposed to the style of a school or of a
period or of a nation—style had almost disappeared from the art-historical
terminology. However, it has recently been 'rediscovered;' once 'king of
the discipline', it was believed dead, but 'the father has been impossible
to lay entirely to rest'.[1] It is quite significant that a renewed interest in the
issue of style is emerging at a time when, after long-lasting neglect, there
has been renewed attention in aesthetics and art theory to the issue of
form.[2]

From its foundation as an autonomous discipline, art history has been
intimately concerned with the concept of 'style', and the historiography
of the visual arts has frequently been conceived as an organic narra-
tive regarding the 'life cycle' of styles, according to a biological model of
birth, growth, decay and death, or a seasonal scheme of spring, summer,
autumn and winter. Vasari explicitly aims at identifying stylistic features
in describing modes and manners ('i modi, le arie, le maniere, i tratti e le

---

[1] Jás Elsner, 'Style', in *Critical Terms for Art History*, ed. Robert S. Nelson and Richard
Shiff (Chicago, IL, 2003) 98–109. He remarks that the first edition 1996 had 'excluded not
only "style" but also its key cognates—"form", "connoisseurship", even that interesting and
frequent entailment of stylistic art-historical analysis, "the artist"' (98). The cognate con-
cepts still remain excluded.

[2] See Nick Zangwill, 'In Defence of Moderate Aesthetic Formalism', *The Philosophical
Quarterly* 50.201, (2000) 476–93; Nick Zangwill, 'In Defence of Extreme Formalism About
Inorganic Nature', *British Journal of Aesthetics* 45.2 (2005) 185–91; Glenn Parsons and Allen
Carlson, 'New Formalism and the Aesthetic Appreciation of Nature', *The Journal of Aesthet-
ics and Art Criticism* 62.4 (2004) 363–76.

fantasie de' pittori e degli scultori').[3] In the Preface written in 1763 for his *History of the Art of Antiquity*, Winckelmann declared that his intention was to write not a simple narration of the chronological succession of artists and works of art, but rather an account of the origins, development, changes and decline of art, and of the variations of styles ('den verschiedenen Stilen') according to peoples, ages, artists.[4]

In the second half of the nineteenth century,[5] with the publication of Gottfried Semper's *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts* (1860–63), the concept became the core of the epistemology of art history.[6] It remained so even for the subsequent generation of art historians who were critical of Semper (or rather of Semperians), such as Alois Riegl and Heinrich Wölfflin.[7] Active between the end of the century and the first decades of the twentieth century, Riegl and Wölfflin, only to mention two of the most influential art historians, were inspired by the formalistic paradigm of so-called *pure visibility* ('reine Sichtbarkeit') developed theoretically by Konrad Fiedler and Adolf von Hildebrand.[8] Beyond their individual differences, a common view shared by these authors was the idea that the experience of the work of art (both in production and in reception), intended as a formal construction of lines and colours, planes and volumes, is related to our bodily organization, and especially to optical schemes or

---

[3] Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori: nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, ed. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi, 4 vols., (Florence, 1966, ed. 1568, Proemio alla Parte Seconda); See Philip Sohm, 'Ordering History with Style. Giorgio Vasari on the Art of History', in *Antiquity and its Interpreters*, ed. Alina Payne, Ann Kuttner and Rebekah Smick (Cambridge, 2000) 42 ff.; Philip Sohm, *Style in the Art Theory of Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge, 2001).

[4] Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity* (1764), trans. Alex Potts and Harry Francis Mallgrave (Los Angeles, 2006). See Lorenz Dittmann, 'Zur Entwicklung des Stilbegriffs bis Winckelmann', in *Kunstgeschichte und Kunsttheorie 1400–1900*, ed. Peter Ganz, Martin Goosebruch, Nicholas Meier and Martin Warnke (Wiesbaden, 1991) 189–218.

[5] See the overview offered by Michael Podro, *The Critical Historians of Art* (New Haven, CT, 1982). On the connection of style and form in the nineteenth century see David Summers, 'Form: Nineteenth-Century Metaphysics, and the Problem of Art Historical Description', *Critical Inquiry* 15.2 (1989) 372–406.

[6] Gottfried Semper, *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts: or, Practical Aesthetics* (1860–1863), trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Michael Robinson (Santa Monica, CA, 2004).

[7] See, for example, Alois Riegl, *Problems of Style* (1893), trans. Evelyn Kain (Princeton, NJ, 1992); Heinrich Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art* (1915), trans. Marie Donald Mackie Hottinger (New York, 1932).

[8] Konrad Fiedler, *On Judging Works of Visual Arts* (1876), trans. Henry Schaefer-Simmern and Fulmer Mood (Berkeley, CA, 1949); Adolf von Hildebrand, 'The Problem of Form in the Fine Arts' (1893), in *Empathy, Form and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873–1893*, ed. Harry F. Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonomou (Santa Monica, CA, 1994) 227–79.

conditions of the possibility of vision, which can be described in their historical evolution (from ancient Egypt to the late Roman Empire in Riegl, from Renaissance to Baroque in Wölfflin), moving from a previously linear-tactile (haptic) phase to a later pictorial-optical phase. The history of styles was therefore strictly intertwined with the history of *aisthesis*, of bodily perception and sensation.

Although mainly developed in the German-speaking countries, this formalistic approach to style can be recognized all over Europe.[9] In France it was developed by Henri Focillon, in England by Roger Fry and Clive Bell and in Italy by Roberto Longhi and Lionello Venturi.[10] Clement Greenberg was the major channel for its diffusion in the United States, where such an interpretative model, thanks to its fusion with the category of 'modernism', became the key for the comprehension of the so-called Abstract Expressionism of Jackson Pollock and others after the Second World War.[11] It was later adopted by Michael Fried and applied even to eighteenth-century art.[12] This approach exercised a long-lasting influence, if one considers that the critical discourse of the 1980s and 1990s—for example that of Rosalind Krauss—felt the need again and again to start with the rejection of Greenberg's assumptions and of his fetishism of vision.[13]

In the second half of the twentieth century—the period we want to focus on here—the rejection or at least retrenchment of formalism did not mean the disappearance of the issue of 'style' from theoretical and

---

[9] See the anthology edited by Roberto Salvini, *La critica d'arte della pura visibilità e del formalismo* (Milan, 1977); French translation: *Pure visibilité et formalisme dans la critique d'art au début du XXᵉ siècle* (Paris, 1988).

[10] See Henri Focillon, *The Life of Forms in Art* (1934), trans. Charles Beecher Hogan and George Kubler (New York, 1989); Roger Fry, *Vision and Design* (London, 1920); Clive Bell, *Art* (New York, 1914); Roberto Longhi, *Breve ma veridica storia della pittura italiana* (1914) (Milan, 2001); Lionello Venturi, 'La mia prospettiva estetica' (1952–53), in *La mia prospettiva estetica*, ed. Luigi Stefanini (Brescia, 1953) 245–56.

[11] Clement Greenberg, *The Collected Essays and Criticism*, 4 vols. ed. by John O'Brian (Chicago, IL, 1986). See especially 'Avant-Garde and Kitsch' (1939) and 'Towards a Newer Laocoon' (1940), in vol. 1 (1939–1944) 5–22 and 23–38; 'On Looking at Pictures. Review of *Painting and Painters* by Lionello Venturi' (1945), in vol. 2 (1945–49) 34–35; 'Modernist Painting' (1960), in vol. 4 (1957–69) 85–93. See, too, Greenberg, 'Necessity of "Formalism"', *New Literary History* 3.1 (1971) 171–5.

[12] Michael Fried, 'Art and Objecthood' (1967), in Fried, *Art and Objecthood* (Chicago, IL, 1998); Fried, *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot* (Chicago, IL, 1988).

[13] Thierry de Duve and Rosalind Krauss, 'Echoes of the Readymade: Critique of Pure Modernism', *October* 70 (1994) 60–97; Yve-Alain Bois and Rosalind E. Krauss, *Formless: A User's Guide* (New York, 1997); Timothy James Clark, 'Clement Greenberg's Theory of Art', *Critical Inquiry* 9.1 (1982) 139–56.

methodological discourse on art. Quite the contrary, especially if we con-
sider the British and American context, which seems to have displaced
the German domain as the predominant cultural field of the debate of
style.[14]

As an effective bridge between the golden age of theories of style of
late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Austro-German art history
and the anglophone theories of style of the second half of the twentieth
century we might take the figure of Meyer Schapiro. His famous essay
on 'Style' (1953) still offers a very useful map of the various issues raised
by the question of style for the history of art and more generally for the
history of culture. The essay was originally published in a handbook on
anthropology, and rather than assuming a personal position, he was more
interested in illuminating the strengths and weaknesses of current theo-
ries of style, and his remarkable practice as an art historian aided him in
finding very effective counter-arguments.[15] He started out with a defini-
tion of style that is still of use in determining the main conceptual axis
of the style-debate developed from the second half of the twentieth cen-
tury up to the present: 'By style is usually meant the constant form—and
sometimes the constant elements, qualities, and expression—in the art
of an individual or a group. The term is also applied to the whole activity
of an individual or society, as in speaking of a "life-style" or the "style of
a civilization".'[16]

Following this definition, we can extract three major conceptual ten-
sions which crossed and still cross the field 'style'. The very beginning of
the definition, 'constant form', already contains two implicit antitheses:
'form vs. content' (possibly 'expressed' by that form) and 'constancy vs.

---

[14] It is only very recently that there has been a renewed interest in 'Stilgeschichte'
amongst German scholars. See, for example, Franz Neckenig's monograph *Stil-Geschichte
der Kunst: Eine ganzheitliche Methode* (Berlin, 2010); the collection of essays *Stilfragen zur
Kunst des Mittelalters: Eine Einführung*, ed. Bruno Klein and Bruno Boerner (Berlin, 2006);
and the anthology edited by Caecilie Weissert, *Stil in der Kunstgeschichte: Neue Wege
der Forschung* (Darmstadt, 2009), including texts by Heinrich Wölfflin, Alois Riegl, Paul
Frankl, Hans Georg Gadamer, George Kubler, Richard Wollheim, and Willibald Sauerlän-
der, amongst others.

[15] Meyer Schapiro, 'Style', in *Anthropology Today*, ed. Alfred L. Kroeber (Chicago, IL,
1953) 287–312. A second revised version was published in Meyer Schapiro, *Theory and Phi-
losophy of Art: Style, Artist and Society* (New York, 1994) 51–102. On the role played by this
article see: James Ackerman, 'On Rereading "Style"', *Social Research* 45 (1978) 153–63; Alan
Wallach, 'Meyer Schapiro's Essay on Style: Falling into the Void', *Journal of Aesthetics and
Art Criticism* 55.1 (1997) 11–15. See, too, Alfred L. Kroeber, *Style and Civilizations* (Ithaca,
NY, 1957).

[16] Schapiro in Kroeber, ed., *Anthropology Today*, 287.

change'; the reference to the 'activity of an individual or society' hints at style as a principle both of individualization and of generalization, evoking the opposition 'individual vs. general'. In what follows I undertake a survey of the contemporary theories of style structured according to these three binary oppositions, the tensions of which are reflected in art-historical discourse. Given the shift mentioned earlier in anglophone thinking as regards the approach to the question of style, I analyse both European and American thinkers, focusing on the most relevant theoretical options rather than on specific historiographic studies that have applied those options to the historical study of single artists or schools or periods.

Form/Content: How versus What

Identifying style with form, that is, the *how* or the *way* something is done or made, as opposed to the *what*, does indeed sound a common-sense dualism. Nelson Goodman explicitly recognizes it, opening his 1975 essay on the status of style with an obvious, current distinction: 'Subject is what is said, style is how', assuming the 'saying' in its widest meaning.[17]

Such a view seems well founded both on etymological and historical grounds. Etymologically, the term 'style' comes from 'stilus', the ancient instrument for writing.[18] From the stilus as a tool, its meaning came metonymically to embrace the 'ductus', the rhythm of the handwriting, independent of the subject matter, and finally to include the literary and more generally artistic style as we still know and use it. Historically, cognate terms of style in early Italian art-historical writing, such as 'maniera' (manner) and 'modo' (mode), confirm the affinity between style and the way the hand moves using its tools and modifying its materials.

The reference to modalities of using tools is emphasized by Arthur Danto, who goes back to the etymological root of style in 'stilus', and remarks that a peculiar feature of this writing stick and its derivates (paintbrush, pastel, etc.) is that it is not only an instrument of representation of something but also represents itself in representing, leaves traces of itself, so that a trained eye can recognize, beside *what* is represented, also *how*, hence 'its interesting property of depositing something of its

---

[17] Nelson Goodman, 'The Status of Style', *Critical Inquiry* 1.4 (1975) 799.
[18] Willibald Sauerländer, 'From "Stilus" to Style: Reflections on the Fate of a Notion', *Art History* 6.3 (1983) 253–70.

own character on the surfaces it scores'.[19] Style is the *how*, 'what remains of a representation when we subtract its content', its *what*, although in concrete executions 'it is difficult to separate style from substance, since they arise together in a single impulse'. The same content or substance can be represented in different styles (although we can separate style and content only through an abstraction).

Ernst Gombrich opened his 1968 essay on 'Style' by stating that 'style is any distinctive, and therefore recognizable, *way* in which an act is performed or an artefact made or ought to be performed and made'.[20] Different ways of performing or of making imply intention and choice; the linguist Stephen Ullmann maintains that style is a question of deliberate choice among simultaneous alternatives, in other words, it is ultimately grounded on synonymy: 'Synonymy, in the widest sense of the term, lies at the root of the whole problem of style' not only in literary expression, but also in visual (and musical and whatever other kind of) representation.[21] One could hardly find a critic of synonymy more severe than Nelson Goodman; as Goodman states, 'ways of saying' (and the possibility to deliberately choose an alternative among many ways) is an ambiguous expression, which implies that the same thing can be said in different synonymic ways. But synonymy cannot explain style; for there are no two terms that convey exactly the same meaning; different ways of saying things say different things. And this is true not only for verbal language, but also for visual language (a position very similar to Konrad Fiedler's perspective that Goodman might have known through Cassirer): no two images which can convey exactly the same meaning (whatever this meaning might be: spiritual, emotional, intellectual, historical, etc.). Each image constructs its own meaning, which comes to existence only in that very image.

Challenging the separation between 'packaging' and 'content' is the extreme result of Goodman's rejection of that common-sense distinction between the how and the what, which seemed so obvious and natural, and which is, in fact, untenable. Architecture, non-objective painting, and

---

[19] Arthur C. Danto, *The Transfiguration of The Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art* (Cambridge, MA, 1981) 197.
[20] Ernst Gombrich, 'Style' (1968) in *The Art of Art History. A Critical Anthology*, ed. Donald Preziosi (Oxford 1998) 150, italics mine.
[21] Stephen Ullmann, *Style in the French Novel* (Cambridge, 1957) 6. See also Eric D. Hirsch, 'Stylistics and Synonymy', *Critical Inquiry* 1.3 (1975) 559–79.

most music do not have any subject-matter or content in the strict sense, and the question of the 'what' is consequently meaningless; nevertheless they do have a style. Moreover, some features of style address the question of subject-matter rather than the mere manner of articulating it. In various ways content is involved; *what* is said or expressed can be an aspect of the *manner* of saying or expressing. In the end, as Goodman states, 'what is said, how it is said, what is expressed, and how it is expressed are all intimately interrelated and involved in style.'[22] If the separation of form and content is problematic (Danto) or impossible (Goodman), is it still reasonable to continue to talk about 'what' and 'how'?

Formalism and Iconology

Viewed not from a theoretical point of view, but rather within the frame of the history of the methodologies of art history and theory, the couple 'how/what' synthesizes the opposition 'formalism/iconology', which was frequently presented as a sharp alternative during twentieth-century critical debate. As early as 1931, Edgar Wind proposed a methodological conflict in opposing the culture- and content-oriented stance of Aby Warburg to the form-oriented approach of Heinrich Wölfflin, a conflict which came to be oversimplified in successive decades: 'With the intention of determining the factors conditioning the formation of style more thoroughly than had hitherto been done, [Warburg] took up Burckhardt's work and extended it in the very direction that Wölfflin, also in the interest of a deeper understanding of the formation of style, had deliberately eschewed.'[23]

During its golden age, the iconological focus on subject-matter, literary programs, meanings and symbols strongly reduced the interest in stylistic analysis in art-historical research; after the 1950s, as Irving Lavin put it with humour, 'style went out of style', and was supplanted not only by iconology, but also by the social history of art.[24] Erwin Panofsky had started his career with a strong criticism of Wölfflin's formalistic theory of

---

[22] Goodman, 'The Status of Style', 803.
[23] Edgar Wind, 'Warburg's Concept of Kulturwissenschaft and its Meaning for Aesthetics (1931)', in Wind, *The Eloquence of Symbols*, ed. by Jaynie Anderson (Oxford, 1983) 24–5.
[24] Irving Lavin, 'Introduction' to Erwin Panofsky, *Three Essays on Style*, ed. Irving Lavin (Cambridge, MA, 1995) 3.

style.[25] But, since a rejection of formalism does not immediately mean a rejection of *Stilgeschichte*, he nevertheless maintained throughout his life a significant interest in stylistic issues, as is shown in the recently published collection *Three Essays on Style*, which contains 'What is Baroque?' (1934), 'On Movies' (1936; then rewritten as 'Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures' in 1947) and 'The Ideological Antecedents of the Rolls-Royce Radiator' (1963).[26] What is striking about this group of heterogeneous texts is the fact that Panofsky adopts a polarizing method not so different from that employed by Wölfflin and Riegl. Consequently, the essence of the Baroque is seen as a dialectic tension between antiquity and naturalism; the essence of film is identified with the dynamization of space and the spatialization of time; the essence of British art (its 'Englishness') is found in the tension between a subjective emotional romanticism and formal rationalism.

Within the iconological tradition, the Polish art historian Jan Białostocki tried to investigate the deep connection between style, iconology and iconography.[27] His views are particularly stimulating for understanding the relationship between style and mode. Drawing on Poussin's famous letter of 1647 to his patron Paul Fréart de Chantelou about modes, Białostocki argues that the many differences attributed to styles are actually distinctions in 'modi', to be linked to the different subjects, as well as the distinct functions of the work, the ways of expression requested, the social contexts, or the requirements of patrons. This is most evident in the case of quotation of past styles: the 'style' of Schinkel, for example, should be a broad enough concept to embrace both his Neo-Classical and his Neo-Gothic modi. Likewise, what are usually called the different styles of Picasso should be regarded as different modi within the same Picassian style. Modes can be intentionally chosen, styles cannot be deliberately adopted.

---

[25] Erwin Panofsky, 'Das Problem des Stils in der bildenden Kunst' (1915) in *Deutschsprachige Aufsätze* ed. Karen Michels and Martin Warnke (Berlin, 1998), vol. 2, 1009–19.

[26] In Panofsky, *Three Essays on Style*.

[27] See Jan Białostocki, 'Das Modusproblem in den bildenden Künsten', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 24.2 (1961) 128–41; Białostocki, *Stil und Ikonographie* (Dresden, 1966).

Individual/General. The Individual and Its Psychological Unity

As regards the individual, the debate on the concept of style seems to have inherited the old medieval litigation between realists and nominalists, the former accepting the real existence of universals, the latter denying them in favour of the exclusive reality of singular beings. In the tradition of the secular nominalism of Anglo-Saxon thought, we are not surprised to find passionate defences of individual style among British and American art historians and theorists; style, when extended to domains other than that of the individual, is a mere 'flatus vocis', a pure abstraction lacking reality.

James Ackerman is such a nominalist theorist.[28] For Ackerman style is not an entity that is discovered, but rather a 'generalization which we form, by comparing individual works, into shapes that are convenient for historical and critical purposes'.[29] It is a net of relations, a heuristic function that we 'abstract' from the concrete world of singular works of art. The question 'what is style?' is thus meaningless: 'There is no objective correlative for our image of a style.'[30] He is hostile towards notions of the spirit of the age or, more generally, any supra-personal (social, national, racial, religious, ideological) power: 'The individual work of art, and not the force of some vague destiny, might be seen as the prime mover of the historical process revealed by style.'[31]

One of the most rigorous versions of this nominalist perspective is that of Richard Wollheim.[32] Focusing on pictorial style, Wollheim distinguishes a *general* style from an *individual* style (the only really existing: 'one artist, one style'). The first is subdivided into universal style (e.g. Baroque), historical or period style (e.g. Northern Baroque), and school style (e.g. school of Leiden), and results from an abstractive inference from a common set of features obtained by comparison, and can be grasped by a mere taxonomic description. In contrast to this the concept of individual

---

[28] James S. Ackerman, 'A Theory of Style', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20.3 (1962) 227–37.

[29] Ackerman, 'A Theory of Style', 237.

[30] Ackerman, 'A Theory of Style', 228.

[31] Ackerman, 'A Theory of Style', 237.

[32] See Richard Wollheim, 'Pictorial Style: Two Views', in *The Concept of Style*, ed. Berel Lang (Philadelphia, PA, 1979) 129–45; Wollheim, *Painting as an Art* (London, 1987) 25–36; Wollheim, 'Style in painting', in *The Question of Style in Philosophy and the Arts*, ed. Caroline van Eck, James McAllister and Renée Van de Vall (Cambridge, 1995) 37–49.

style (e.g. the style of Rembrandt) needs to be understood on the basis of its generation; the meaning of a painting depends on the mind of a painter (or painters if the authorship is plural) and on the psychological factors that motivate her or his intentions. While forming a style, the artist develops two practical skills: segmenting the elements of a painting into privileged 'schemata', and constituting 'rules or principles' for operating with those schemata.

Wollheim seems nevertheless to fall victim to a reification of style when he claims that 'In any given work or in any given body of work of an artist, his style may not be employed in its entirety'.[33] Should we then regard style as something apart from individual works of art? The question of the universal, initially rejected, is reintroduced, appearing as one of those entities coined by simply conceiving anything following the article 'the' as a really existing phenomenon (such as 'the' Baroque, or 'the' Style of Picasso), what Gilbert Ryle calls 'systematically misleading expressions' that hypostatize a concept.[34]

The risk of such reification is underlined by Svetlana Alpers as well: 'These presumably objective categories of large historical classifications are then (silently) treated as aesthetic properties of each object. Style, designated by the art historian, is treated as if it were possessed by each object.'[35] Considering style 'a depressing affair indeed', she tries to avoid the terminology of style altogether, speaking of seventeenth-century Dutch art rather than Northern Baroque, although periodization is, of course, no less questionable than style.[36]

Less of a nominalist, and more inclined to acknowledge the heuristic force of the notion of general style and to grant it psychological status, is Arthur Danto, who holds to the reality of collective styles as well. Style appears as a system of embodied representation; a subject sees the world through such a system, but does not see the system, which is transparent to her or him. As with individuals, so periods have an analogous structure, which is comprehensible only to the historian who looks at it from an

---

[33] Wollheim in Van Eck, *The Question of Style*, 46.

[34] See Gilbert Ryle, 'Systematically Misleading Expressions' (1932) in Ryle, *Collected Papers* 2 (London, 1971) 39–62. Ryle's linguistic doctrine, as a criticism of the improper reification of style, is employed in relation to art history by Raymond A. Macdonald, 'The Styles of Art History: Entities or Processes?' *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 7.1 (1993) 48–63.

[35] Svetlana Alpers 'Style Is What You Make It: The Visual Arts Once Again', in Lang, *The Concept of Style*, 96.

[36] See Peter Sor and Sándor Radnóti, eds., *Stilepoche: Theorie und Diskussion* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990).

external point of view, whereas for the people of the corresponding period it was simply their way of living. The structure of a style is similar to the structure of a personality: 'Style and personality are strongly enough connected that we might as well invert Buffon's astute thought and claim *L'homme, c'est le style même.*'[37]

Style and Structure

What troubles individualist theorists of style is the worry that by granting general styles some sort of reality or existence, the path is then opened to metaphysical approaches such as the spirit of the age, the spirit of culture, the essence of the nation, or some other supra-individual force of a Hegelian flavour. But the individual is evidently no less a problematic entity, and its psychological, physiological, intentional and motivational unity is far from being an obvious and natural notion. Within theories of style, important authors seem to be aware of the fact that both general and individual styles share the same structural status, in that a style relates a unity to a plurality of aspects. All of these phenomena are themes of which only variations are given, and no single variation can exhaust the theme in itself.[38] Such a musical metaphor was employed by the social art historian Arnold Hauser to characterize style as what he believed to be the most fundamental concept in art history; for Hauser it was only on the basis of the concept of 'style' that art history was even possible, and its basic problems could be formulated.[39]

'Style' can be seen as the ideal unity of a whole consisting of many heterogeneous traits. Such a structure resembles a figure in the sense of Gestalt theory, a figure which refers to the modification of a basic, non-existent form. Expanding this point, we might perhaps talk of the *inexistence* of style, meaning both that it is inexistent (in other words, that it does not exist apart from its instantiation in concrete works) and that it exists in them, or inheres in them (just like a theme in its variations). The nexus between style and a Gestalt structure in the perceptual field has been explicitly investigated by the Gestalt psychologist and art theorist

---

[37] Danto, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace*, 207.

[38] On the possibility of grasping a style from a statistic analysis of the components of an artist's oeuvre with computer software, see David Cope, *Computers and Musical Style* (Oxford, 1991). A criticism of such an attempt is provided in Igor Douven, 'Style and Supervenience', *British Journal of Aesthetics* 39.3 (1999) 255–62.

[39] See Arnold Hauser, *The Philosophy of Art History* (London, 1958), Chapter 4 § 5.

Rudolf Arnheim.[40] A Gestalt approach to the issue of style might avoid the false alternatives of: (1) constancy/change (the structure remains constant although its vehicle changes); (2) individual/group (both are structures organizing a multiplicity of properties); (3) determinism/liberty (the individual is totally determined, although the result is not a simple sum of the causes, but 'an entirely new structure').[41] Styles therefore are not objects, but rather the temporary result of the interactions in a field of forces.

The idea of a similarity between the experience of style and perception, although with no direct reference to Gestalt theory, has also been developed within anthropology by Alfred Gell in *Art and Agency*.[42] For Gell any perceived object is seen as an invariant structure under transformation of its perceptual aspects. Similarly, what is invariant under transformation is what links any work by an artist to all his or her other works as aspects of the same structure: 'Stylistic perception, I argue, is the perceptual mode with which we deal with multiple or distributed objects of this kind. As such, stylistic theory is just an extension of the theory of perception itself.'[43] Such an approach helps correct perspectives that are too individualistic (and therefore Eurocentric), especially in research into non-European art, where stylistic units are not individual artists but rather cultures.[44]

Another way of avoiding the individual as a real psychological unitary entity, conceived of as the ground of style, is the pragmatist approach suggested by Kendall Walton.[45] Criticizing the confusion between styles as attributes of objects and attributes of actions, Walton claims that 'styles of art are to be understood in terms of the notion of styles of action. Specifically, attributing a style to a work involves, somehow, the idea of the manner in which it was made, the act of creating it.'[46] This conception is supported by different factors; we describe the style of a work by speaking of the style it is *done* in; when we are concerned with styles of paintings, we prefer to speak of styles of *painting*; when we speak of objects which

---

[40] Rudolf Arnheim, 'Style as a Gestalt Problem', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 39.3 (1981) 281–9.

[41] Arnheim, 'Style as a Gestalt Problem', 286.

[42] Alfred Gell, *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory* (Oxford, 1998). See especially Chapter 8: 'Style and Culture', 155–220.

[43] Gell, *Art and Agency,* 167.

[44] See George Kubler, 'Towards a Reductive Theory of Visual Style', in Lang, ed., *The Concept of Style,* 119–27; Margaret W. Conkey and Christine A. Hastorf, eds., *The Uses of Style in Archaeology* (Cambridge, 1990).

[45] Kendall L. Walton, 'Style and the Products and Processes of Art', in Lang, ed., *The Concept of Style,* 45–66.

[46] Walton in Lang, *The Concept of Style,* 46.

are not human artefacts but natural things, even if our interest in them is aesthetic, we do not make recourse to the notion of style. As Walton states, 'Natural objects do not have style.'[47]

Constancy and Change: Synchrony versus Diachrony

Schapiro defines style in terms of constant form and constant elements; constancy constitutes a delicate question which is embedded in the very nature of art *history* as a *story* of art. Ackerman emphasizes the concept of style as an instrument of art-historical writing: 'For history to be written at all we must find in what we study factors which at once are consistent enough to be distinguishable and changeable enough to have a "story".'[48] Such a dialectic of stability and flexibility is crucial to the notion of style, which permits the institution of relationships among works of art realized at the same time or place and by the same artist or artistic group (or, vice versa, to infer from works of art of the same style information about where, when and by whom). Change and stability are the two poles which not only define the interpretative operations of the art historian, but also the productive operations of the artists themselves: 'Unlike a machine, he [the artist] cannot reproduce without inventing. . . . Conversely, the artist cannot invent without reproducing.'[49] The balance between stability and change varies of course depending on cultures and epochs; stability is the dominant pole in ancient Egypt, whereas change is prevalent in twentieth-century art. The privileged role assigned to the individual artist cannot be exempted from understanding non-individual patterns and sequences justified by art-historical evidence; for example, the fact that Greek, Gothic and Renaissance (but not Roman and Carolingian) art all show a 'classic' phase of stylistic equilibrium demands a proper explanation 'that avoids on the one hand the tyranny of external historical forces or laws, and on the other hand the anarchy of mere chance'.[50]

Panofsky also argued that it is logically impossible to establish an 'innovation' if this is not perceived against a background of constancy and stability: 'An innovation—the alteration of what is established—necessarily

---

[47] Walton in Lang, ed., *The Concept of Style*, 56. Goodman admits on the contrary the possibility of a natural style. See his argument on the 'Mandalay sunrise in Mandalay style', (in Goodman, 'The Status of Style', 808).
[48] Ackerman, 'A Theory of Style', 227.
[49] Ackerman, 'A Theory of Style', 228.
[50] Ackerman, 'A Theory of Style', 233.

presupposes that which is established (whether we call it a tradition, a convention, a style, or a mode of thought) as a constant in relation to which the innovation is a variable.'[51] Against this, the most radical critic of style as constancy has been George Kubler, for whom style is evanescent in diachronic studies, and should be completely dissociated from any sort of duration: 'The history of style is therefore a history of continuous *change* rather than of constant *forms*.'[52] According to Kubler a sort of deceptive constancy hypothesis is responsible for a major misunderstanding of the concept of style as a static object, enduring through time, as if it were an object, which we perceive as constant although in our perception its forms and colours vary according to changing light and motion. Thus 'we wrongly assign to style the constancy of an object in perception whenever we examine it diachronically'.[53] Particularly with regard to time, Kubler maintains that a time-scale should always be provided in order to specify the meaning of the notion of 'style' itself, 'with some index such as an integral sign to designate the scale of the time being defined. For example, "medieval style" implies the millenary scale, or style $\int_{400}^{1400}$ as contrasted with the "style" of a single painting by Picasso, which may be assigned in some cases to a specific quarter-hour on a known day'.[54]

Narratives of Style

Pro-constancy and anti-constancy theorists nevertheless share an anti-narrative doctrine of style.[55] Kubler's approach requires that in the first place allegorization is avoided: one should not treat styles 'as though they were persons in a generational novel'.[56] In addition Ackerman wants to avoid the narrative determinism typical of many style theories; evolution appears as preordained and necessary, so that an earlier stylistic phase

---

[51] Erwin Panofsky, '"Renaissance:" Self-Definition or Self-Deception?' in *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*, by Erwin Panofsky and Lena I. Gedin (Stockholm, 1965) 1–41, here 2.

[52] George Kubler, 'Towards a Reductive Theory', 126. See also Kubler, 'Style and the Representation of Historical Time', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 138/2, 2 (1967) 849–55; Kubler, 'Period, Style and Meaning in Ancient American Art', *New Literary History* 1.2 (1970) 127–44. See, too, Joyce Brodsky, 'Continuity and Discontinuity in Style: A Problem in Art Historical Methodology', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 39.1 (1980) 27–37.

[53] Kubler, 'Towards a Reductive Theory', 126.

[54] Kubler, 'Towards a Reductive Theory', 125.

[55] On narration and style see Jonathan Gilmore, *The Life of a Style: Beginnings and Endings in the Narrative History of Art* (London, 2000).

[56] Kubler, 'Towards a Reductive Theory', 119–20.

is destined to transform itself into the later. The fact that art historians understand successive artistic realizations as increasingly successful trials to solve the same problem (a 'natural' and obvious process) shows that they fall victims of a typical 'hindsight'. No artist can be aware of the works to come; he or she knows only the past and the present: 'Are we, then, justified in saying that he has moved toward the future? In his terms the future is a void—how can he move toward it? If he dreams of its wonders, the dreams themselves, like his art, are creations of the present.'[57] Stylistic changes should not be described in terms of an evolution of successive steps performed in order to solve the same problem, but rather as a series of steps away from previous statements of a problem; with each solution, the nature of the problem itself is modified.

Gombrich also warned against such retrospective constructions of necessitated development.[58] Subsequently, Arthur Danto also addressed the question of narrative style, linking it to the more general issue of narration in historical research.[59] When we say that the Gauls were preparing the language of Racine and Cocteau, or that Cézanne was preparing the figurative language of Cubism, we employ *narrative sentences* that lay upon features present at the time of the Gauls or of Cézanne, but that became visible only 'in the retroscopic light' of successive developments. This leads to 'Sentences by which an earlier event is described with reference to a later one, yielding thereby descriptions under which events cannot have been witnessed at the time of their occurrence, for whatever reason it is that their future was hidden to those who might have witnessed them. We have no difficulty with them, however, since their future is our past, which the narrative sentence serves to organize under narrative structure.'[60] Danto conceives a test to check the consistency of a narrative sentence; could it have been accepted 'without conceptual perturbations at the time of its truth?'[61]

Nevertheless, a narrative is possible for criticism, and Danto goes so far as to defend a peculiar kind of retrospective interpretation and of anachronism in his theory of the 'style matrix'.[62] Let us presume the only two stylistic predicates of the critical discourse in a given period

[57] Ackerman, 'A Theory of Style', 231.
[58] Gombrich, 'Style', in Preziosi, ed., *The Art of Art History. A Critical Anthology*, 150–63.
[59] Arthur Danto, 'Narrative and Style', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 49.3 (1991) 201–9.
[60] Danto, 'Narrative and Style', 201.
[61] Danto, 'Narrative and Style'.
[62] Arthur Danto, 'The Artworld', *Journal of Philosophy* 61.19 (Oct. 15, 1964) 571–84.

are 'representational' and 'expressionist'. The style matrix of the period will allow certain combinations: 'representational expressionistic' (e.g. Fauvism); 'representational nonexpressionistic' (Ingres); 'nonrepresentational expressionistic' (Abstract Expressionism); 'nonrepresentational nonexpressionist' (hard-edge abstraction)'.[63] Adding further predicates will increase the number of styles available. But, what is peculiar is that any new introduction of a predicate x (with its opposite non-x) will cause a 'retroactive enrichment of the entities in the artworld' so that all works will start from then to be also x or non-x. As Noël Carroll has stated, 'after the advent of German expressionism, Grünewald's painting may be relabelled "expressionist".'[64]

Conclusion

As early as 1979 Kubler had remarked that 'style is a word of which the everyday use has deteriorated in our time to the level of banality. It is now a word to avoid, along with déclassé words, words without nuance, words grey with fatigue. The first step is to restore limits and shape to the shapeless objects of verbal abuse; to rediscover the purposes to which the word in question was appropriate; and to demonstrate its present inacceptable uses.'[65] The unquestionable fact that, in spite of its problematic nature, art-historical discourse has kept using the notion of style, sometimes in an undercover way, and has recently rediscovered it, is perhaps due to its flexible semantic power; it is able—as we have seen—to embrace different and even opposite meanings. Not least amongst the reasons for its effectiveness is its capacity to serve normative (both aesthetic and ideological) aims often disguised as descriptive goals. As Gombrich clearly put it: 'Style is any distinctive, and therefore recognizable, way in which an act is performed or an artefact made or *ought* to be performed and made.'[66]

---

63 Danto, 'The Artworld', 583.
64 Noël Carroll, 'Danto, Style, and Intention', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 53.3 (1995) 256. Carroll argues that such theory of the matrix is inconsistent with Danto's ideas on style and should be rejected.
65 Kubler, 'Towards a Reductive Theory', 119.
66 Gombrich in Preziosi, *The Art of Art History*, 150 (italics mine). On the normative power of inclusion/exclusion of style see also his essay 'Norm and Form. The Stylistic Categories of Art History and their Origins in Renaissance Ideals', in Gombrich, *Norm and Form* (London, 1966) 81–98.

VISUAL CULTURE AND VISUAL STUDIES

Jan Baetens[1]

In the last decades, the disciplines of art history, cultural studies, and visual studies have emerged as a complex field, both unified (after all, the core business of all these approaches is art and culture) and torn between often very antagonistic interpretations of what the field should stand for. The syntagm 'art and culture', for instance, is far from being unproblematic, since some emphasize the conjunctive meaning of the word 'and', while others will stress its disjunctive power. Since academic discussions are always wrapped up with issues of power and the institutionalization of established and emergent fields, the literature on the relationships between art history, cultural studies, and visual studies may seem overtly polemical, distorted by often very personal arguments and attacks which are not always helpful to a better understanding of the concrete stakes of a newcomer in the field, such as in this case visual studies. As with cultural studies, which, in many cases, is still awaiting institutionalization outside the Anglo-Saxon world, most of the debates on visual studies can be localized in either the United States or in Britain and, within the Anglo-Saxon world, more in the former than the latter. The obligation to innovate at all price and, more and more, to mediatize this innovative drive at all levels, ensures that American universities are more open to disciplinary debates than continental institutions. To put it more precisely: Anglo-American disciplinary debates very quickly take the form of debates between 'older' and 'newer' disciplines, whereas in other national traditions, the same debates may produce radical shifts as well, but always within the same discipline (German 'Kulturwissenschaft' being a case in point). Nevertheless, it remains, I think, very useful to take as a starting point the general hypothesis that visual studies is more or less doing in the field of art history what cultural studies did twenty or thirty years ago in the field of literary studies.

A case at hand is the (in)famous attack on the field of visual studies—
and its specific object: *visual culture*—by Rosalind Krauss: 'I hate visual
culture'.[2] In 1996, Krauss and the editorial team composed a special issue
of the journal *October*, actually a questionnaire submitted to a wide range
of specialists in various related fields, on 'The Interdisciplinary Project of
Visual Culture?' which James Elkins summarized as follows in his much
more temperate book *Visual Studies. A Skeptical Introduction*:

> The general tenor of that forum—and here I am forced to simplify what is
> really a wide spectrum of detailed responses—was that visual culture is a
> disorganized, possibly ineffectual, illegitimate, and even misguided exten-
> sion of art history and other disciplines. The art historian Rosalind Krauss
> summed up the reactions best when she proposed that visual studies is
> really only training students to become better consumers.[3]

Elkins adds, not without irony: 'The *October* survey is particularly interest-
ing because the people who responded would generally be identified with
the more experimental sides of art history and literary criticism, and yet a
number of the letters are openly or covertly sceptical.'[4] In other words—
that is at least how I read these words—some of those who are opposed
to visual studies may actually be doing it. The case of the *October* group
is more complex, however, for their important survey *Art since 1900* dem-
onstrates that its members are perhaps less linked with the experimental
side than one may infer from Elkins's remark.[5]

The entire discussion of visual culture/visual studies, which continues
today (although with less harshness), cannot be separated from matters
of distinction, in Bourdieu's sense of the word, and from institutional
questions (the discussion of what disciplines are or ought to be). Thus,
for Bourdieu, within the field of art theory, various competing paradigms
struggle for survival, i.e. symbolic capital, and they do so by distinguishing

---

[2] Scott Rothkopf, 'Krauss and the Art of Cultural Controversy: Interview with Rosalind
Krauss', *The Harvard Crimson* (May 1997), online at http://www.thecrimson.com/article
.aspx?ref=112770 (accessed 14 September 2010).

[3] James Elkins, *Visual Studies: A Skeptical Introduction* (New York and London, 2003)
18. Elkins was, in fact, quite sympathetic to the new field, despite the subtitle, and made
a good attempt to bridge the gap between the programme of art history in general and
the insights and cravings of the new discipline. The original questionnaire was published
in *October* 77 (1996) 25–70 (special section on: 'The Interdisciplinary Project of Visual
Culture?').

[4] Elkins, *Visual Studies*, 18–19.

[5] Yve-Alain Bois, Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, Hal Foster, and Rosalind Krauss, *Art Since
1900: Modernism, Antimodernism and Postmodernism* (London, 2004).

themselves as much as possible from their nearest competitor.[6] This illustrates very clearly the extent to which defenders and critics of new and old disciplines—visual studies being on the side of newness, art history on that of tradition—behave tactically as well as strategically. If one wants to understand what visual studies is, and what it is about, it is necessary to acknowledge its latent or open conflict with art history, for as David Joselit puts it in a telling phrase: 'In other words, visual culture and art history mutually serve as each other's Other.'[7]

Before tackling the issue from a greater distance, let us consider these questions of otherness, and examine the reproaches art historians address to visual studies and, of course, vice versa. Here again, a short quote from Krauss may be useful, for its emphasis on both the institutional and the transdisciplinary aspects of the problem (for what has been happening in the art history field has happened before in literature and cultural studies, among others):

> Like cultural studies, visual culture is aimed at what we could call pejoratively, abusively, deskilling. Part of that project is to attack the very idea of disciplines which are bound to knowing how to do something, certain skills. Obviously, in French literature you would have to be able to read French very well, not just modern French but Medieval French. In art history there are also skills, like connoisseurship, and at least some slight knowledge of conservation.[8]

What is wrong with visual studies, in Krauss's eyes, is the following: first of all, it is an incomplete and self-mutilated form of art history. It is art history minus what makes art history an academic discipline, i.e. the various auxiliary disciplines (Krauss mentions connoisseurship and restoration, but one might complete this list by adding history, institutional critique, philosophy, literature, hermeneutics, chemistry, and so on.) Without these basic skills, no correct reading of images is possible. Second, visual studies does not only deskill the student, but offers a license to free-floating and subjective interpretations, which are not only biased and short-sighted but heavily manipulated by the pressures of the surrounding culture. Visual culture, Krauss continues, surrenders to contemporary culture, leaving students and citizens no other role than that of a consuming participant, deprived of any possibility of withdrawing from the visual stimuli and

---

[6] Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. and trans. Randal Johnson (Cambridge, 1996).

[7] David Joselit, *Feedback: Television against Democracy* (Cambridge, MA, 2007) 31.

[8] Rothkopf, 'Interview with Rosalind Krauss'.

incapable of establishing differences of value within the massive visual offer. Quoting Fredric Jameson, Krauss defines this environment as all-visual and all-commercial.[9]

Within this visual framework, in which beholders are also customers and vice versa, the study of visual culture inevitably implies the shallow and fashionable reproduction of the values of the day and of the niche market with which every viewer tends to identify in order to distinguish himself or herself from other customers. Visual studies, in the perspective of Krauss and her supporters, is nothing else than a naturalization and legitimization of corporate interests which erode the traditional canon in order to make room for their own products.

Of course, the reproaches go both ways, for while art historians criticize visual studies, exponents of the latter criticize art history as well. For advocates of visual culture such as Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright, authors of an influential handbook, traditional art history incarnates the disciplinary closing down of a complex object as well as the cultural, social, and political blindness such a closure implies, although art historians may reply that such an old-fashioned view of their discipline no longer matches reality, so that many of these attacks are obsolete and have lost much of their sting. [10] In this regard one might say that visual studies reveals the ideological underpinnings of the construction of the object of art history, namely 'art', which explains the violent reaction of this discipline whose very existence is questioned by the turn to visual culture. From a visual studies point of view, art history is considered to be a futile and bourgeois training and production of connoisseurs, i.e. people able to assess and value pieces sold in auctions and bought as investments. This may be a highly skilled and super-professionalized occupation, but it is unacceptable for several reasons. First, art history maintains and even strengthens the myth of the individual artist and the creative freedom materialized in individual works of art. Second, it adopts an uncritical stance toward the financial and economic underpinnings of the art business, whose values and norms are in blatant contradiction with the autonomy of the art world to which art history seems to adhere, or at least pay lip-service. Third, art history may not indulge in consumerist extravaganzas, yet it

---

[9] Rosalind Krauss, '*A Voyage on the North Sea': Art in the Age of the Post-medium Condition* (London, 1998) 56. See Fredric Jameson, *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983–1998* (London and New York, 1998).

[10] Lisa Cartwright and Marita Sturken, eds., *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture* (Oxford, 2001).

has tight links with the elitist world of the gatekeepers of the taste market. A synthetic view on these issues can be found for instance in many writings of authors such as Victor Burgin, Alan Sekula, and Abigail Solomon-Godeau (all well represented in the important reader *Visual Culture* edited by two leading scholars based in cultural studies).[11]

In many regards, these reciprocal reproaches do not sound very new. They bring to mind the discussions that accompanied the (American) breakthrough of cultural studies more than two decades ago. However, there is one fundamental difference. Whereas cultural studies continues to nourish a violent dream of anti-disciplinarity (and not simply of interdisciplinarity), many proponents of visual studies, which claims the right to increased interdisciplinarity, define it as a new field, and, in some extreme cases, a new paradigm.[12]

As always, the rise of a new discipline—for visual studies is more than a field and less than a paradigm—cannot be explained by the mere discovery of new objects, but originates as well in reaction to the flaws, if not the crises, of existing disciplines.[13] In the case of art history versus visual studies, it is of course the very crisis of the notion of art and the dismantling of notions such as 'beauty' and 'taste', on the one hand, and 'work', 'author', and 'style', on the other, which have played a crucial role in these transformations. What is particularly interesting is that it was art historians who had debunked all these notions—just after art itself had started to do so. Twentieth-century art can indeed be characterized as a moving away from the retinal to the intellectual or the conceptual (hence the debunking of all criteria based on beauty and taste), as a denunciation of the 'distinction' of producer and consumer on the economically determined art market (hence the critical rereading of notions such as creative freedom and pleasure with no purpose), and as the inscription of the work into its social and discursive spaces (hence the deflation of the material and intellectual autonomy of the work of art). Given this generalized crisis of the artwork, one might say that it is only normal that art history is in crisis, for what is the sense of making a plea against deskilling when

---

[11] Jessica Evans and Stuart Hall, eds., *Visual Culture: The Reader* (Thousand Oaks, CA, and London, 1999).

[12] On the question of interdisciplinarity see Stanley Fish, *Professional Correctness: Literary Studies and Political Change* (Oxford, 1995). See, too, the proceedings of the conference that 'institutionalized' Cultural Studies in the US: Larry Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, eds., *Cultural Studies* (New York and London, 1992) and the critical stance of Ben Agger, *Cultural Studies as Critical Theory* (London, 1992).

[13] Margaret Dikovitskaya, *Visual Culture: The Study of the Visual after the Cultural Turn* (Cambridge, MA, 2005).

some forms of art no longer take the traditional technical skills of the artist for granted? And why train connoisseurs if, as a theoretically well-informed art historian, one has to acknowledge that individual author-ship is a deceptive notion? Once again, art historians may rightfully reply here that these critiques are overgeneralizations, for not all contempo-rary artists are post-Duchampian and many use old and new media in an extremely skilled way.

However, is art history not capable of criticizing its own theoretical flaws? Many progressive art historians have certainly continued to do so since the emergence of what has been dubbed 'new art history' since the early 1980s, but in many respects this critique does not really overthrow the basic assumptions of the discipline that visual studies tries to dismantle.

First: the death of the subject. Although the fading of the subject, to reuse a metaphor coined by Roland Barthes, is now a stereotype, if not a *doxa*, in every well thought-out critical theory of art, there is something very strange going on in the field, which contradicts the ideological claims against the author. As Jean Galard argues:

> One of the strange things that can be observed in twentieth-century art history is this: while the related notions of work of art and author became progressively less consistent, the notion of author succeeded in maintaining and even in reinforcing its own consistency. Instead of a fading away of the notion of the artist, and at the same time of that of the work of art, it is the contrary that happened: an exaggeration of the moral and social status of the artist, an overvaluation of the fact of 'being an artist'. For last century's art history is, among other things, the history of a shift in focus: from the finished work of art to the creative act, from the work to the gesture.[14]

Second: the myth of the avant-garde. Although Krauss and others have denounced the myth of the avant-garde's *originality*, the valorization, if not idealization of the avant-garde stance is still alive and well, as dem-onstrated not only by the many neo-avant-garde movements but also, and even more importantly, by the unchallenged position of avant-garde criticism in contemporary theory.[15] Here the idea of a merging of 'art' and 'life' on the one hand and of the critical potential of art on the other has become increasingly important, but whether this position is supported by any concrete action, is another question. More importantly, the teleo-

---

[14] Jean Galard, 'L'art sans œuvre', in *L'œuvre d'art totale*, ed. Jean Galard and Julian Zugazagoitia (Paris, 2003) 168; author's translation.
[15] Rosalind Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cam-bridge, MA, 1985).

logical orientation of the classic avant-garde, which everybody discards as naïve and old-fashioned, survives perfectly well in the so-called 'transcendental' theory of art, which has been attacked by scholars such as Jean-Marie Schaeffer.[16] The very persistence of this 'transcendental' theory and, as a corollary, the relative solitude of critics such as Schaeffer clearly demonstrates that teleological views of art remain very robust—which in turn is only possible when high art (and on top of it: avant-garde art) is successfully distinguished from all kinds of commercial art. This second aspect, which limits the critique of traditional art history to its newer forms, is perfectly compatible, moreover, with the shift from 'subject' to 'artist'. New art historians have their own martyrs and heroes, who are no longer modernist 'geniuses' like Cézanne or Picasso, but avant-garde 'artists' like Duchamp and Broodthaers. And 'artists' are no less idols than 'geniuses'.

Third: the reinforcement of the institutionalized position of the arbiter of taste. Like their predecessors, new art historians continue to give good and bad scores, they discover forgotten artists while condemning others to the trashcan of history. Today, some art historians seem as important as sellers and buyers, i.e. gallery owners, museum executives, and private and public investors and collectors, in the making and unmaking of artistic reputations, i.e. value, although this impression may be created in part by the rise of the academic star system, whose effects are deeply felt in the world of art history. Here too, everything is interconnected; the new art historians who are doing away with the notion of the subject are not absent from the international curatorial jet set and the academic star system that goes with it.[17] Of course, it would be erroneous to put all the responsibility for this on art history. Many curators have a different background, and the ideological, political, and commercial agenda of many of these transnational events completely escapes the control of the art world itself.

Fourth: as one can infer from Peter Lunenfeld, the critique of Western ethnocentrism is often very hollow. There is a false sense of universalism and ethnic and cultural diversity, which does not stick to the reality of the art world and its business as usual. In order to fine-tune the terms of the fratricidal relationship between art historians and proponents of

---

[16] Jean-Marie Schaeffer, *Art of the Modern Age: Philosophy of Art from Kant to Heidegger* (Princeton, NJ, 2000).
[17] Peter Lunenfeld, *User: Infotechnodemo: Mediaworkbook* (Cambridge, MA, 2005) 53–4.

visual culture, it does of course not suffice to define visual studies as the mirrored—and supposedly 'positive'—opposite of art history. Although it remains very difficult to give a purely internal view of the discipline, the terms of what visual culture may stand for are exemplarily exposed by David Joselit:

> Within the humanities, studies in visual culture have arisen as one type of response to the challenge of tracking the 'social life of things'. Recent scholarship in this field has been structured along four axes: method, archive, technology, and reception.[18]

This short comment provides a good summary on what visual studies stands for. Methodologically, it adopts an almost anthropological view of the artwork, which it studies as a cultural phenomenon rather than as an object, examining the way it reflects a whole culture and the way cultural production plays a certain role in a given society. It is not object-oriented, nor is it subject-oriented (the subject being that of the artist of the work in question). In this sense, it can reasonably be stressed that visual studies is extremely close to cultural studies, whose almost anarchic use of interdisciplinarity—or, more precisely, the almost anarchic combination or *bricolage* of tools borrowed from a wide range of humanist disciplines (mainly sociology, philosophy, literary theory)—is often quoted as a role model. By the notion of 'archive', Joselit hints to the fact that visual studies opens the field of research to a whole range of objects which until then were kept at the margins of the fine arts circuit: commercial art, vernacular art, products of the culture industry, advertisements, in short all possible types of images that are produced, consumed, transformed, and interpreted within a certain cultural context. The locus of what is being studied is no longer the museum or the gallery, but the new media (first photography, then film and television, nowadays the Internet.)

Fifth: as the emphasis on new media has already shown, visual studies foregrounds the idea that visual objects cannot be separated from ways of seeing, which are in their turn determined by technological frameworks. Just as the 'frame' of a traditional painting had a certain influence on the way it was looked at, so the technological infrastructure of the new media influences the way we 'work' with images. The emergence of radar screens, for instance, which allows for looking at screens displaying moving objects in real time, has radically transformed our ways of looking at

---

[18] Joselit, *Feedback,* 31.

older forms of screens, that of the painting (as a static window on a static world) and later that of film and television (as static windows on a moving world.)

Finally, the idea of 'reception' denotes the conviction that meaning is not only context-bound, but open to the spectator's appropriation. Looking at art becomes doing things with visual objects, spectatorship being linked with image production, and no longer just with image reception. Here too, the influence of cultural studies can be felt very strongly, both in the rejection of any 'dominant' meaning (i.e. the meaning imposed by those who have the power to impose 'their' meaning and the subsequent attempt to present this partial meaning as natural, i.e. universal, strictly inferred from the properties of the image itself) and by the encouragement to take into account 'dominated' meaning or counter-discourses (i.e. meanings produced by marginal viewers, who manage to 'use' the images as objects in their everyday life and to develop counter-hegemonic, non-canonical uses, mostly non-aesthetic uses and interpretations of these images.)

Obviously, all this is clearly linked to reflections on the paradigm shift produced by the so-called pictorial turn.[19] By this concept, one does not only refer to the gradual disappearance of textual literacy and the growing, yet chaotic spread of visual literacy, which implies mainly an abandon of the technical vocabulary used to read and interpret texts as well as the rise of completely other world views and other ways of thinking. As the editors of a ground-breaking collection on the relationship between sound and vision explain, it is the lack of distance between image and perception that constitutes the representative feature of the world as shaped by the visual turn:

> Perhaps the dominance of the image in our understanding of film is a reflection of the traditional association of knowing with seeing. . . . The surfeit of possibilities tells us what we already know: we live in a world saturated by images. In a sense, the distance that was traditionally required to view an image has entered a state of seemingly permanent collapse. The image is now a proximate form, always almost too close. Images cling to us; our vision is cluttered with them.[20]

---

[19] William J.T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation* (Chicago, IL, 1994) 11–35.

[20] Daniel Goldmar, Lawrence Kramer, and Richard Leppert, Introduction: 'Phonoplay. Recasting Film Music', in *Beyond the Soundtrack: Representing Music in Cinema*, ed. Daniel Goldmar, Lawrence Kramer, and Richard Leppert (Berkeley, CA, 2007) 2.

On the other hand, there is also something very strange in the alleged closeness of visual studies and cultural studies. For if visual studies clearly belongs to the same intellectual framework as the latter, the consequences of the opposition between the traditional disciplines (for instance literary studies and art history) and the new ones (cultural studies and visual studies) remain much less clear in the case of visual studies than in the case of cultural studies. In other words: the possibly revolutionary impact of visual studies remains more or less virtual, not only because art history departments seem to have a stronger capacity for resistance than literary departments, but also because of the relative timidity of visual studies itself—which is, at least in the Anglo-Saxon world, a more academic occupation than much of what is being done in cultural studies. Contrary to what is often argued in cultural studies, there has never been a claim of 'anti-disciplinarity', and the very success of many typically visual studies arguments in current art-historical and art-theoretical debates, which are undergoing an undeniable *aggiornamento*, demonstrate that the water between the two disciplines is not so deep as it may seem at first sight. It should therefore not come as a surprise that visual studies is not only criticized from the outside, namely from art history and its auxiliary academic fields, but also from within. In the latter case, visual studies is disapproved of for not being visual studies *enough*.

    A clear and convincing case—it is nourished, after all, by sympathy— for visual studies was made by James Elkins in his aforementioned *Skeptical Introduction*. Yet Elkins is far from blind to certain flaws of the emerging field, and his (friendly) remarks have become the model for many subsequent critiques. Roughly speaking, Elkins thinks that visual studies as it actually is, is too easy, i.e. too fashionable, too uncritical of its own assumptions, too eager to please instead of being ready to challenge its promoters and readers intellectually, too Western, too burdened with political correctness and stylistic stereotypes, and so on. He proposes in a kind of manifesto 'Ten Ways to Make Visual Studies More Difficult', for instance, by opening the corpus to scientific (i.e. non-artistic) images, to take science (i.e. the natural sciences) really seriously, and to establish a dialogue with non-Western visual literacies, instead of making only politically correct analyses of non-Western representations, or—which is naturally worse in this perspective—of Western representations of non-Western realities.[21] If one wants to specify these and other general claims,

---

[21] Elkins, *Visual Studies,* 63–123; see also Matthew Rampley, 'Bildwissenschaft: Theories of the Image in German-Language Scholarship' (119–134 in this volume).

one might say that the main points of a new research programme in visual culture are not only (or no longer) defined in terms of (visual) objects, but, more generally and more generically, in terms of ways of processing (visual) information.

To start with, it is clear that visual studies in the first place should develop a sharp view of the cognitive interface between the visual object or practice on the one hand and the personal and social experience of visuality on the other hand. Research in cognitive sciences as well as in visual semiotics, more specifically about the multiply determined framings of the image and of visual culture in general, will have to play a paramount role. In this regard, the work by Groupe Mu, with its double emphasis on the interaction between semiotics and pragmatics, should continue to function as a permanent source of inspiration, unfortunately too little known outside the Francophone world.[22] Also extremely challenging and innovative is the recent interest of tensive semiotics (as developed by Jacques Fontanille) in the scientific image, whose structures and functions exceed the traditional dominant explicative paradigms in all possible ways.[23] The latter were either aesthetic (as in, for instance, Rudolf Arnheim's theory on visual thinking) or socially, psychoanalytically, and politically coloured (in the wake of Walter Benjamin, Pierre Bourdieu, Norman Bryson, Michel de Certeau, Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, Laura Mulvey, and many others.[24] It should be stressed here that the most important efforts in this field, however, have currently been made by medievalists, who have foregrounded theoretical and epistemological notions such as imagination and the imaginary on the one hand, and visual experience and synaesthesia on the other hand.[25]

[22] Groupe MU (Francis Edeline, Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, and Philippe Minguet), *Traité du signe visuel* (Paris, 1993).

[23] Jacques Fontanille, *Sémiotique du visible: Des mondes de lumière* (Paris, 1995); Fontanille, 'Les systèmes d'imagerie scientifique. Questions sémiotiques', *E/C, rivista dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Semiotici on-line,* http://www.ec-aiss.it/ (accessed 24 June 2008).

[24] Rudolf Arnheim, *Visual Thinking* (Berkeley, CA, 1972). See Sarah Chaplin and John A. Walker, *Visual Culture: An Introduction* (Manchester, 1997); Nicholas Mirzoeff, ed., *The Visual Culture Reader* (London, 1998); Evans and Hall, eds., *Visual Culture: The Reader*; Cartwright and Sturken, eds., *Practices of Looking.*

[25] See Ralph Dekoninck, Agnès Guiderdoni, and Walter Melion, eds., *Ut pictura meditatio: The Meditative Image in Northern Art, 1500–1700* (Leiden, forthcoming). See Sémir Badir and Nathalie Roelens, eds., *Visible* 3 (2008) (special issue on synaesthesia and syncretism).

A second aspect might concern new ways of theorizing visual think-
ing. If it is now generally accepted that objects can 'think', for, thanks
to new scientific models on the hybridization of the human agent, for
instance in ANT (actor network theory), it is no longer possible to main-
tain an absolute distinction between thinking subjects and objects that
are thought of.[26] The main issue here should be the relation—analogy
as well as difference—to traditional ways of conceptualization and of
theoretical thinking, in order to avoid over-hasty inferences regarding
the power of images. If it is undeniable that images have a strong cog-
nitive and pragmatic function (for we need images to think, not just to
think with), it might be dangerous to conclude from this possibility, or
even this requirement, that images can do all the theoretical thinking and
that other, namely verbal, forms of thinking and discourse are no longer
necessary and even harmful, as has sometimes been suggested in gender-
theoretical approaches that focus on the distinction between the putative
masculinity of the word and the femininity of the image:

> The father tongue is the language of social power, the one that is learnt at
> universities and exercised in academic gatherings. It is the public discourse,
> and one dialect of it is speechmaking, another is much documentary narra-
> tion. It is generally a written form; even when spoken dialects are involved,
> the traces of written speech are felt.[27]

Rather than opposing 'bad' (authoritarian) and 'good' (collaborative)
ways of speechmaking, it might be interesting to emphasize the limits of
a strictly visual 'language' (which can never be a 'language' in the tradi-
tional, literal sense of the word) and therefore also the restrictions of theo-
rization with(in) images only, and to stress the urgency to inscribe visual
thinking within broader frameworks of verbal discourse.[28] Rejecting the
currently popular claim that 'images are capable of thinking', Jacques
Aumont argues that images (in his case films, but the argument can be
generalized) can make us think, but can only become a real theoretical
statement when verbal discourse adds the basic requirements of theory
and rational thinking: speculative power, internal coherence, and explica-
tive value. Images themselves are incapable of doing that job, and need

---

[26] Sherry Turkle, ed., *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With* (Cambridge, MA, 2007).

[27] Susan Dermody, 'The Pressure of the Unconscious upon the Image: The Subjective
Voice in Documentary', in *Fields of Vision: Essays in Film Studies, Visual Anthropology and
Photography*, ed. Leslie Devereaux and Roger Hillman (Berkeley, CA, 1995) 299.

[28] Jacques Aumont, 'Un film peut-il être un acte de théorie ?' *Cinémas* 17.2/3 (2007)
193–211.

therefore a discursive complement. Seen from this perspective, it should be clear that the idea of purely visual thinking cannot offer a complete alternative for traditional, verbal discourse and theorization.

A third point all research in visual studies has to take into account is the issue of intermediality and hybridization. Given the inevitable inter-weaving of words and images and, moreover, their growing integration in the 'supermedium' of the computer, visual studies has to develop an unambiguous strategy to counter 'too easy' (Elkins) and over-fashionable generalizations about hybridity in the post-medium age. First of all, it should be acknowledged that the encounter of media, and even their mixing, does not entail the vanishing of medium-specific questions and preoccupations. As stated by Lev Manovich:

> Today, as more artists are turning to new media, few are willing to under-take systematic, laboratory-like research into its elements and basic com-positional, expressive, and generative strategies. Yet this is exactly the kind of research undertaken by Russian and German avant-garde artists of the 1920s in places like Vkhutemas and Bauhaus, as they explored the new media of their time: photography, film, new print technologies, telephony. Today, those few who are able to resist the immediate temptation to create 'an interactive CD-ROM', or make a feature-length 'digital film', and instead focus on determining the new-media equivalent of a shot, sentence, word, or even letter, are rewarded with amazing findings.[29]

Instead, the increasing combination of the verbal and the visual does not need to be interpreted in terms of blurring of boundaries only, but can also be analysed in terms of renewed specifications.[30] Crucial in this regard is the new vision of intermediality, as elaborated for instance, in journals such as *Intermédialités*. As argued by Henk Oosterling, interme-diality is much broader than the artistic and semiotic meaning that may reduce it to a set of variations on the *Gesamtkunstwerk*. On the contrary, it needs to be considered as an aspect of the philosophy of difference, interlinking the files of arts, politics and science, and emphasizing the permanent openness and clashes of the 'in-between'.[31] Moreover, and as clearly expressed in the statement by Manovich, the avoidance of some counterproductive, but very fashionable, ideas of generalized hybridity

---

[29] Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, MA, 2001) 15.
[30] For some examples, see Jan Baetens and Hilde Van Gelder, eds., 'Hybridization', *History of Photography*, Special Issue, 32.1 (2007).
[31] Henk Oosterling, 'Sens(a)ble Intermediality and Interesse: Towards an Ontology of the In-Between', *Intermédialités* 1.1 (2003) 29–46.

should be accompanied by a solid and persistent focus, not just a focus on the specific medium in which visual culture is taking place but also, and often very humbly, on the specific objects that are shaping it.

Fourth and finally, and this too is an aspect pointed at by James Elkins, any serious work in visual culture should be to a certain extent practice-based, whatever the concrete signification of 'practice' may be in this context (for Elkins, it does not only have to do with matters of visual literacy, which may be lacking in some cases, although that does not prevent anyone from writing on visual culture). The broader framework of this issue is of course the two cultures debate (C.P. Snow): just as visual studies should accept a dialogue with science outside the traditional humanities, it should also try to do away with the age-old difference between theory and practice, fine arts and applied arts, art-historical research and practice-led research 'in' the arts, academic and non-academic, and so on. The current interest in forerunners of contemporary art history like Aby Warburg, one of the founding fathers of the *Bildwissenschaft*, may be understood in this light, but the same of course could apply to the less recent importance given to the trajectory of Walter Benjamin.

To conclude, visual studies has everything to be welcomed as a useful complement to art history—and to theoretical research in the field of aesthetics—provided it can succeed both in avoiding a certain number of over-easy stances and positions and in implementing basic issues that often come from outside the visual field in the narrow sense of the word. Recent examples, such as Cécile Whiting's study of the relationships between avant-garde and urban environment in the 1960s, Liz Kotz's reappraisal of word and image issues in postmodernism, and Robin Kelsey's rereading of survey photography around 1870, have demonstrated that such a merger is more than wishful thinking and one can therefore only hope that in a very near future the polemical relationship between art history and visual studies will be seen as a remnant of the past.[32]

The work of Robin Kelsey can be very helpful as an illustration of what a visual studies approach can achieve. In our dominant perceptions of the geographical survey images he studies, there is an almost absolute gap between the two extremes of 'archive' and 'style'. Archive: the impersonal

---

[32] Cécile Whiting, *Pop L.A. Art and the City in the 1960s* (Berkeley, CA, 2006); Liz Kotz, *Words to be Looked at*: *Language in 1960s Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2007); Robin Kelsey, *Archive Style*: *Photographs and Illustrations for U.S. Surveys, 1850–1890* (Berkeley, CA, 2007).

constitution of repetitive and strictly controlled collections of images, where no place whatsoever is left to the personal touch of the photographer, who is less an artist than an employee. Style: the attempt of some exceptional individuals, Timothy O'Sullivan (c. 1840–82) and Carleton E. Watkins (1829–1916), for instance, to give form and expression to a personal, highly individual and subjective work that exceeds in all regards the archival straightjacket. In *Archive Style*, Kelsey makes a totally different claim. Rather than stressing the unproductive antagonism of style and archive, he takes as his starting point the creative and artistic possibilities of the survey work and its often mechanical and bureaucratic conditions—to generate innovative and original practices as a result of the creative clash between on the one hand the rules of the archive—i.e., in the sense coined by Foucault, the rules governing what can be said and what cannot—and on the other the individual profile and desires of the visual artist who resists the archive as much as he undergoes it.

This approach, which at the same time reduces and underlines the importance of the individual subject, is transformed by Kelsey into an over-arching reading method that is both very simple (thanks to the sharpness of its basic concepts) and extremely sophisticated (thanks to the wealth of historical information that is provided and the astuteness of its interpretations). Although *Archive Style* makes only sparse use of heavy metadiscursive or metatheoretical artillery, the work of scholars such as Allan Sekula or Jacques Derrida, for instance, is employed in an exemplary fashion to foreground a type of reading that manages to change many stereotypical views of nineteenth-century US survey photography. For instance, Kelsey studies in very close detail the audience and circulation of the collections produced by a photographer like O'Sullivan. His images were used for local (Washington DC) and national circulation, in the former case for lobbying activities, in the latter case for goodwill and promotional activities, and both types of use and reuse were hotly debated.

Many Congressmen and tax-payers resisted the cost of the (often aesthetic but scientifically debatable) images that accompanied the reports published by the national printer, for instance. Yet it was precisely the harshness of this situation—with many conflicting demands of the commissioners, the difficult reconciliation of old and new techniques and models, the social distance at which the artists were kept by most of the leading officials, the economic insecurity of short-term contracts in an exile country—that made O'Sullivan invent new ways of picturing the national territory. Kelsey does not analyse these innovations from a merely formal, proto- or pre-formalist perspective, but by asking questions such

as: Which images were available as models at that time? Which images did the administration wish for or prefer? Why did the authors nevertheless produce something different? And why were these images finally accepted? Kelsey pays great attention to the cultural as well as to the social dimension of the artists' work. From the cultural point of view, he emphasizes the fundamental openness of the archive. The survey brought about new situations, for which the administration had not yet found the models to be followed or obeyed, and the official desire for 'positive' pictures—clearly visible in the fact that so few of the commissioned images were actually used (or used only in modified or censored forms)—was so vague that there was room for personal input. From the social point of view, the author focuses on the political imbalance between those (WASP, i.e. White Anglo-Saxon Protestant, and wealthy) who were in charge of the expeditions and those (often from other ethnic and religious backgrounds, and not always well educated) encountered during field-work.

The four axes put forward by David Joselit in his definition of visual studies, namely 'method', 'archive', 'technology', and 'reception', are all clearly present in Kelsey's approach. Methodologically, the spirit of the book is solidly interdisciplinary—a cross-over between history, art history, and critical theory. The works that are analysed are those produced within the broader social context, although aesthetic considerations are never left aside or despised. The importance of the technological aspect of photography making (not just of the mechanical process itself, but of the whole social practice of the photographic survey) makes that the study of images is part of a larger medium theory. And, finally, the insistence on the social dimension of the image reception, which did not only take place in an artistic or aesthetic environment, makes room for an in-depth discussion of the interpretive shifts in the reading of images.

THEORIES OF THE IMAGE IN FRANCE:
BETWEEN ART HISTORY AND VISUAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Ralph Dekoninck

Translated by Matthew Rampley

> A properly founded reflection on art, a 'science' of art
> could only be both historical and theoretical.
> *Henri Zerner*[1]

Introduction

Let us start with the recognition of the importance that studies of the image and of the visual in general have had for philosophical research in France in the twentieth century. In order to be convinced of this it suffices to refer to the work of thinkers who have enjoyed an undeniable critical fate such as Jacques Aumont, Roland Barthes, Jean Baudrillard, Alain Besançon, Pierre Bourdieu, Christine Buci-Glucksman, Dominique Chateau, Guy Debord, Régis Debray, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Pierre Fresnault-Deruelle, Nathalie Heinich, Luce Irigaray, Julia Kristeva, Jacques Lacan, Jean-Claude Lebensztejn, Jaqueline Lichtenstein, Jean-François Lyotard, Henri Maldiney, Jean-Luc Marion, Jean-Luc Nancy, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Christian Metz, Marie-José Mondzain, Jacques Rancière, Rainer Rochlitz, Jean-Marie Schaeffer, Jean-Luc Schefer, Bernard Stiegler, Paul Virilio or Jean-Jacques Wunenburger.[2] Even if it is the

---

[1] Henri Zerner, 'L'art', in *Faire de l'histoire*, ed. Jacques Le Goff and Piere Nora, *Nouvelles approches* (Paris, 1974) 183–202.

[2] See, for example, Jacques Aumont, *The Image*, trans. Claire Pajackowska (London, 1997); Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans. Richard Howard (London, 1993); Jean Baudrillard, *Screened Out*, trans. Chris Turner (London, 2002); Alain Besançon, *The Forbidden Image: An Intellectual History of Iconoclasm*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Chicago, IL, 2001); Pierre Bourdieu, *Photography: A Middle-brow Art*, trans. Shaun Whiteside (London, 1996); Christine Buci-Glucksman, *Baroque Reason: The Aesthetics of Modernity*, trans. Patrick Camiller (London, 1994); Dominique Chateau, *Sémiotique et esthétique de l'image: Théorie de l'iconicité* (Paris, 2007); Guy Debord, *Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Fredy Perlman, Tony Verlaan, Paul Sieveking, Michel Prigent, Colin Carsten, and John Fullerton (Detroit, MI, 1968); Régis Debray, *Vie et Mort de l'Image* (Paris, 1995); Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema* (New York, 2001); Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting*, co-author and trans. Geoffrey Bennington (Chicago, IL, 1987); Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the*

custom in the Anglo-Saxon world to subsume the greater number of these authors, the majority of whom are trained philosophers, under the rubric of 'French Theory', it is nevertheless difficult to discern within this constellation of works a shared theory of the image or, at the very least, a communal way of thinking. At most one can emphasize the importance of phenomenology, psychoanalysis and semiotics, alongside the critique, amongst some authors, of Western occularcentrism, in other words, the dominance of vision over the other senses as a privileged mode of grasping the sensible world of cognition.[3]

Yet if these works have influenced 'visual studies', essentially a transatlantic enterprise, then one has to note that they have had hardly any influence on French art history, with a few exceptions that will be addressed later in this chapter.[4] In fact, reflection on the image takes place rather more on the margins of academic art history in France, including either institutions at the margins of universities (Schools of Art, the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, EHESS—'School of Advanced Studies in Social Sciences'—or the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, CNRS) or disciplines at the margins (Literature, History, Sociology, Psychoanalysis, Film Studies).[5] Thus, as Georges Didi-Huberman has commented, 'thinking

---

Human Sciences (London, 1986); Pierre Fresnault-Deruelle, *Le Silence des tableaux* (Paris, 2005); Nathalie Heinich, *De la visibilité. Excellence et singularité en régime démocratique* (Paris, 2012); Luce Irigaray, *Speculum of the Other Woman*, trans. Gillian Gill (Ithaca, 1987); Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Léon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Léon S. Roudiez (Oxford, 1982); Jacques Lacan, *Ecrits: The First Complete Edition in English*, trans. Bruce Fink (New York, 2007); Jean-Claude Lebensztejn, *Annexes—de l'œuvre d'art* (Paris, 1999); Jaqueline Lichtenstein, *La Couleur éloquente: Rhétorique et peinture a l'âge classique* (Paris, 1993); Jean-François Lyotard, *Discourse, Figure*, trans. Antony Hudek and Mary Lydon (Minneapolis, MN, 2010); Henri Maldiney, *Art et existence* (Paris, 2003); Jean-Luc Marion, *La croisée du visible* (Paris, 2007); Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Ground of the Image*, trans. Jeff Fort (New York, 2005); Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Evanston, IL, 1969); Marie-José Mondzain, *Image, icône, économie: Les sources byzantines de l'imaginaires contemporain* (Paris, 1998); Jacques Rancière, *The Future of the Image*, trans. Gregory Elliott (London, 2009); Rainer Rochlitz, *Subversion and Subsidy: Contemporary Art and Aesthetics*, trans. Dafydd Roberts (Chicago, IL, 2008); Jean-Marie Schaeffer, *Art of the Modern Age: Philosophy of Art from Kant to Heidegger*, trans. Steven Rendall (Princeton, NJ, 2000); Jean-Louis Schefer, *Du monde et du mouvement des images* (Paris, 1998); Paul Virilio, *War and Cinema. The Logistics of Perception*, trans. Patrick Camiller (London, 2009); or Jean-Jacques Wunenburger, *L'imaginaire* (Paris, 2003).

[3] See Martin Jay, *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought* (Los Angeles, 1994).

[4] See Roland Recht, 'Remarques liminaires', in *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art en France au XIXᵉ siècle*, ed. Roland Recht, Philippe Sénéchal, Claire Barbillon, and Francois-Rene Martin (Paris, 2008) 13–14.

[5] See for example, the series of volumes published by Gallimard and edited by Jean-Claude Schmitt and François Lissarrague entitled *Le temps des images*.

about the image in France is dispersed'.[6] This is why it is not possible to speak of major theoretical watchwords. If, for some, the lack of dialogue between disciplines is a cause of regret, for Didi-Huberman this fragmentary state contains, in spite of everything, a positive and fecund dimension, for it opens up a field of possibilities and freedom. According to Didi-Huberman this freedom continues a completely unabashedly literary tradition including writers such as Denis Diderot, Charles Baudelaire, Stéphane Mallarmé, Jean Genet, Francis Ponge, and Yves Bonnefoy. 'In France the most striking theoretical texts on the image are nearly all marked by this profound anchoring in the poetic', and he cites examples such as Georges Bataille's writing on Lascaux, Foucault's discussion of *Las Meninas*, or Barthes's reflections on the photograph.[7]

Even if in France art history has sought to keep its distance from this dual philosophical and literary tradition, the latter continues to inspire work with clearly stated theoretical ambitions, but which characteristically apply such reflection to the field of history. This chapter will examine the contribution of critical, historical and anthropological reflection on the visual by thinkers whose work has become part of the field of art history or who sit at its boundaries. For practical reasons the discussion is limited to only a small number of the many authors who might have been included, and it therefore focuses on just the most important and representative figures. In general, however, I would like to suggest that one of the distinctive traits of this research perspective in France can be found in the shared reflection on the problematic articulation of the relation between art theory and art history, on the one hand, and between art and the image on the other, with a particular emphasis on the conditions governing the agency and impact of representations.

Art History and the Theory of Art: A Semiotic Turn

Amongst the pioneers one should mention the name of Pierre Francastel (1900–1970) who was associated right at the beginning with what would later become the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS),

---

6 Georges Didi-Huberman, 'En ordre dispersé', *Trivium* 1 (2008), http://trivium.revues .org/index351.html (accessed 8 September 2009).
7 Georges Bataille, *The Cradle of Humanity: Prehistoric Art and Culture*, trans. Michelle and Stuart Kendall (New York, 2005); Foucault, *The Order of Things*; Barthes, *Camera Lucida*.

bringing together a team of historians working within the *Annales* school. Partly breaking with academic art history, Francastel contributed to the opening up of the discipline to the social sciences. In particular, he opened up the path to what he called a 'sociology of art', in which he was careful to place artworks in the context of the visual culture of the era that produced them, while also remaining attentive to the specific 'figurative thinking' that gave them their form and meaning.[8] Rejecting any kind of determinism (such as the idea of complete dependence on historical context) and any kind of formalism (the idea of the absolute autonomy of the history of forms) he aimed to articulate as best he could the relation between the plastic properties of artworks and the diverse social functions these artworks fulfilled, and to which their plastic values contributed. The originality of his approach lay in his assertion that the latter both depended on and participated in the nature of these functions and their efficacy.

Inspired by this pioneering work, the art-historical research that developed at the EHESS, in particular within the Centre for the History and Theory of Art (CEHTA) set up in 1977 by Hubert Damisch and Louis Marin, attempted to combine the analysis of the socio-historical conditions of the production and reception of artworks with the study of their formal and aesthetic properties. Adopting an approach that thought of itself as structuralist, this research was clearly oriented towards semiotics.[9] Thus for Damisch it was a matter of studying artworks in themselves, apart from any historical determinations, but without losing sight of their structural relation to other artworks or cultural phenomena. For the specific nature of an artwork could only be demonstrated in terms of its differential relation to the artworks it transformed (or indeed by which it was itself transformed), in the sense that it either displaced or reconfigured them.[10] This was why it was necessary to take into account both the specific rhythm and history of artworks, while, equally, not neglecting their interactions with an enlarged historical context. For they only bring to completion

---

[8] See Pierre Francastel, *La Réalité figurative: Éléments structurels de sociologie de l'art*, 2nd edn., (Paris, 1978) and *Études de sociologie de l'art: Création picturale et société* (Paris, 2nd edn., 1989). On Francastel's notion of the sociology of art, see the comments by Nathalie Heinich, 'Sociologies of Art: With and against Art History', (185–195 in this volume).

[9] See Jean-Claude Bonne, 'Art et image', in *Une école pour les sciences sociales*, ed. Jacques Revel and Nathan Watchel (Paris, 1996) 353–65.

[10] Hubert Damisch, 'Histoire et/ou théorie de l'art', *Scolies* 1 (1971) 27–36 and Damisch, ed., *Critique* 315–16, Special Issue 'Histoire/théorie de l'art' (1973).

their own particular aesthetic and semiotic potential in response to the most diverse, individual or collective, intended or unintended finalities. Weaving together different temporalities prompts a rich reflection on the historicity of the artwork. Thus, as we shall later see, it is important to draw on the array of different theories and ideologies that presided over the formation of art history as a body of historical knowledge.

Yet if art history cannot dispense with a theory of history, neither can it hide the theories of art that it consciously or unconsciously mobilizes. Rather than evading the question of beauty, or abandoning the concept of art in favour of a supposedly more neutral concept such as that of the image, we should acknowledge, argues Damisch, that art history and aesthetics operate hand in glove, and that art is, by its nature, a theoretical object. If one therefore wishes to write the history of art, one has to know what its status is and what its forms are at each moment in its history. In other words, one has to trace the constant process of delimitation and redistribution of artistic activity. It follows from this that the art historian's object is nothing other than the array of phenomena which are, in the given period, held to be aesthetic artefacts. This comes back to the point that art history studies above all the history of art as an institution and the collective representations of art. The term 'production of art' should hence be understood not only in terms of the making of artworks, but also in terms of the production and reproduction of the material, ideological and theoretical conditions of such making and its efficacy.

The work of authors such as Louis Marin or Daniel Arasse resonates perfectly with this interrogation of the relation between the theory and history of art. For Marin the main stakes of this relation stem from the recognition of artistic representation as a theoretical object. The latter is theoretical in a twofold manner, both as the construct of a science of art, and also an object that reflects on itself.[11] For every representation represents itself. It is especially this second aspect, which coincides with the idea of figurative thought that was so dear to Francastel, to which Marin's reflection, in its essence, pertains. For him 'the reflexivity within the work of art defines its theoretical dimension'.[12] Focusing mainly on the study of the theory and practice of the sign during the Classical Age, a founding moment in the history of modern representation (aiming towards the

---

[11] Louis Marin, *Des pouvoirs de l'image: gloses* (Paris, 1993).

[12] Louis Marin, *Opacité de la peinture: Essais sur la représentation au Quattrocento* (Paris, 2nd edn., 2006) 17.

ideal of transparency), he thus traces all the zones of opacity (in essence, all of the non-mimetic indices and all thresholds, such as the frame) across which representation is the object of its own thought, thereby revealing the constitutive dialectic between transitivity and reflexivity that enables one to articulate as closely as possible its semantic and expressive poles. An inquiry of this kind into the semiotic and aesthetic modalities of the figuration of such a thought naturally leads him to interrogate the latter's powers which are closely linked to the unstable play of presence and representation. 'All the effects of pleasure and *jouissance* in the imagination and the senses, all its emotional affects in the feelings and the heart, are induced by the sign's opacity.'[13] The interest directed towards the opaque flesh of painting (which therefore goes against the occultation of this 'accursed share' by the classical theory of art) makes it possible to understand how matter, form and meaning become interwoven in the cognitive and emotional experience of the painting. This reflection on the sensible powers of representation open up the way to a more political questioning of the representation of power, which resides, precisely, in representation conceived of as an operation that puts the force of signs, as it were, in reserve.[14] This is the operation that underpins the belief both in the power being represented and also the power of the representation.

Similar conclusions on figurative thinking and on the conditions of the possibility of representation and its agency have been reached in the work of Daniel Arasse, conducted in the wake of Damisch and Marin. Investigating, like the other two authors, the epistemological bases of modern representation and those of art history, his work has consisted of an inquiry into the unseen; not the invisible, as it were, but the optical unconscious hidden within the work. This includes, in short, everything that eludes the normative, on the level both of the construction of the representation (most notably, perspective) and also the conceptual and perceptual framework bequeathed by art history. Only a 'close history' of painting, conceived of as a closed, but dynamic or organic whole that secretes its own thinking, is equal to the task of laying bare what conceptual knowledge excludes or represses.[15] One can discover such 'intimacy', understood both as an object and as an approach, in the details and singular features

---

13 Marin, *Des pouvoirs de l'image*, 955.
14 Louis Marin, *Portrait of the King*, trans. Martha M. Houle (London, 1988).
15 Daniel Arasse, *Le détail: Pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture* (Paris, 1996).

that betray the thought of the work (the presence of the painting) or the presence of the subject in the work (the presence of the painter). In other words, the subjectivity invested in the painting by its author (the genetic approach to the work, concerned with the vestiges of embodied thinking), but also the implication of the subjectivity of the viewer, not to mention that of the art historian, all three of whom are moved by the pleasure and desire aroused by the work.[16] Subject to the enduring effect of the painting through time, the historian has to seek to produce an account of the plot at the heart of the iconic narrative that constitutes its power, by creating a narrative, even a fiction, which aims to enable us to come into intimate contact with the painting and the painter, and thereby to recreate none other than the artist's closeness to the work. This closeness, which must not be mistaken for empathy, can be achieved through the exercise of a reasoned sensibility or a theory open to the senses.

A theory of history and of its writing thus emerges out of this theory of the subject and of the figurative thinking in the work of painting. For it is important to address the delicate issue of how to give a historical perspective to a singularity, how to turn the unique and original thing that is an artwork into an object of knowledge. Conceived of as an event that reiterates itself at each encounter, it is the bearer of its own unique history that the historian has to unravel once more, and which is a function not only of its figurative weft, but also of the different layers of interpretation that weft creates, and which have become sedimented through time, enriching or impoverishing the work's meaning.

Turning from the history of painting to histories of paintings involves, for Arasse, a rethinking of historical knowledge by taking into account the depth of the historical and cultural distance separating the present of the observer and the past of the work. With the strong conviction that when one interrogates the past one is inevitably responding to the present, Arasse sees historical knowledge as put to the test by the anachronism constitutive of every work of art. Placed under the sign of the singular and the intimately private, which cannot escape its own historicity, his work is basically that of a historian who constantly examines the epistemological and aesthetic stakes of temporal and psychic distance (the question of living memory, the work's memory and that of the spectator) as well as physical distance (the question of the intimate gaze) from the artwork.

---

[16] Daniel Arasse, *Histoire de peintures* (Paris, 2004) 199.

Art and the Image: An Anthropological Turn

One can add the writings of Georges Didi-Huberman to this reflection dedicated to the thought and power of images, which are in his case accompanied by a critical revisiting of the epistemological foundations of art history, what he terms 'a critical archaeology of art history'. Inspired by his early research on the figuration of hysteria and on the figurative processes within the painting of Fra Angelico, he has undertaken a deconstruction of the humanist thinking (of writers such as Vasari, Kant and Panofsky) that made possible the establishment of art history as a form of knowledge, which has, as a consequence, reduced the visible to the legible.[17] The main object of his research has been everything that the art history emerging from this humanist tradition has repressed, has been unable to conceptualize or to see. The unthought or the unseen is none other than what has plunged representation into crisis, a critical point to which he gives the name of 'symptom', dialectically linked to the symbol. Derived from Freudian metapsychology, this concept refers to the event where the unconscious bursts in, the repressed returns.

The other key concept is that of embodiment (taken as the symptom's implementation) which permits him to conceive of a visibility beyond appearance. A counter-model or one that diverges from that of classical aesthetics and the theory of mimesis sustaining it, the Christian paradigm of embodiment or incarnation leads Didi-Huberman along the path towards an 'anthropology of the visual', in which the concept of the visual is understood as the unconscious of the visible. However it is not only in reference to Christian dogma that he thinks of embodiment as the major anthropological stake of images, even if it enables him to undertake such an anthropological turn. Instead, he envisages it as a phantasm in a wider cultural sense. This goes on to interrogate the limits of imitation, limits which are crossed over in the fiction of a living image that desires, that offers and opens up its body to the spectator. Whether this is in relation to fables (he cites examples from Ovid, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Balzac and Proust) or the concrete reality of images that reify this phantasm, embodi-

---

[17] Georges Didi-Huberman, *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpetrière*, trans. Alisa Hartz (Cambridge, MA, 2004); Didi-Huberman, *Fra Angelico: Dissemblance and Figuration*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Chicago, IL, 1995); Didi-Huberman, *Confronting Images: Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art*, trans. John Goodman (Philadelphia, PA, 2009).

ment is studied not only as a motif, but also as a motor, in other words, as the cause and effect of the desire that literally sets the body in motion, the body of the image as well as that of the spectator.

To think of the body of the image in relation to the body of the spectator is to give imitation and its anthropomorphic tropes their full anthropological depth. Thought of not as a state so much as a dynamic and relational process with very real pragmatic effects, resemblance has to be viewed in its relation to dissemblance (a polarity that recalls Marin's opposition of opacity and transparency), in a play of dialectics from which representation draws all its power. This accounts for Didi-Huberman's interest in all figurative processes or, in other words, visual effects and phenomena, more so than in visual objects, for they open up the bodies of images and tear down the veil of mimesis all the while addressing the spectator caught up in this play. For one cannot distinguish between the image as an object and the image as subject, or as operation of the subject, hence one should not separate the image from the imagination and the imagination from the psychic economy.[18] This brings us back once more to examination of the belief in the powers of the image.

Such anthropological reflection on the efficacy of the visual, which goes against the tyranny of pure visibility, is necessarily accompanied by a second layer devoted to the temporal dimension of images.[19] Having first scrutinized 'art' as an object, it is then necessary to linger by the object 'history'. For how can one articulate the relation between the timelessness of anthropology and its historical declensions? This is achieved, quite simply, by recognizing that when we stand before the image we stand before time; as Didi-Huberman argues, the present and the past are constantly reconfiguring themselves in the image. If the concept of the 'symptom' made it possible to think through the unconscious of the visible, then the concept of 'survival', borrowed from Aby Warburg, makes it possible to access the unconscious of history.[20] In other words, it enables access to everything that the classical models of temporality (mainly cyclical, linear, even teleological) used by art history do not manage to think.

---

[18] Georges Didi-Huberman, *L'image ouverte: Motifs de l'incarnation dans les arts visuels* (Paris, 2007).

[19] See Georges Didi-Huberman, *Fra Angelico* and *Devant le temps: Histoire de l'art et anachronisme des images* (Paris, 2000).

[20] Georges Didi-Huberman, *L'image survivante: Histoire de l'art et temps des fantômes selon Aby Warburg* (Paris, 2002).

One can start with the idea of anachronism, the accursed share of the historian, which expresses both the *longue durée* of survivals and the discontinuity of historical time. How can the present reconfigure an image from the past, and how can the past survive in a current image? This is linked to the fact that every image is the result of a sedimentation of heterogeneous times. Its meaning can no longer be found exclusively in the era that produced it. Instead, one should sound out its memory in order to gain access to the multiple stratified times of which it is composed. In short, the image is more a matter of memory than of history, and art history should turn itself into a kind of art of memory (a chronological anamnesis consisting of a going back in time contrary to the order of events), where the historian's own memory is implicated in every moment.

Conclusion

'Without theory one will not know what "history" means, nor "art", nor what is meant when one speaks of a "history of art". But without history, there will be no "theory" that has any validity, even if, in the final analysis, art eludes any strictly historicizing treatment.'[21] This could be the *credo* underpinning the thought of French art historians, who are united in their conviction that no history or theory of art can do without an interrogation of the nature of its objects and their historicity. One additional shared issue is the desire to bring back presence to representation, the presence of the painting and of the painter, but also the presence of the spectator, including the presence even of the art historian. The recognition that every historian makes theoretical choices involves a self-reflexive step that lies at the heart of the work of the thinkers presented here.

Another distinctive trait that goes hand in hand with this is their desire as much to bring objects from the past together with contemporary theory, as to bring together theories from the past and objects of the present, in a constant to-and-fro. In a way it involves having objects from the past speak in their own language, all the while showing how what they say still concerns us in the present. It is in this respect that one can speak of a difference from 'mainstream' visual studies, where one can witness a move towards the inverse taking place, where the point of departure is often rather more the society of the spectacle and issues relating to the

---

[21] Bonne, 'Art et image'.

contemporary world, sometimes at the cost of a relegation of history to a secondary level. In contrast to this essentially contemporary orientation, the articulation of the relation of history to theory would appear to be one of the salient features of the oeuvre of these art historians, who are conscious of the depth of history working its way through images. One might thus say that history, just as much as the unconscious, lies at the heart of their theory of art and the image, and that their thinking is traversed by the question of time. Finally, one could summarize their contribution by saying that the image is to be found at the heart of all thinking about time, while time is to be found at the heart of all thinking about the image.

BILDWISSENSCHAFT: THEORIES OF THE IMAGE IN GERMAN-LANGUAGE SCHOLARSHIP

Matthew Rampley

In 1997 the art historian Michael Diers published a small volume of essays entitled *Schlagbilder. Zur politischen Ikonographie der Gegenwart* ('Pictorial Slogans. On the Political Iconography of the Present').[1] Employing the neologism 'Schlagbild' by analogy with the German term for 'slogan' ('Schlagwort') the essays purported to examine the role of the image in the formation and dissemination of political discourse. Consciously working with images from a variety of different media, including news photographs, stamps, paintings, cartoons, and advertising, Diers examined topics such as hand gestures in politics (including the famous handshake of Yassir Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin), the Berlin Wall, or the motif of the wolf in sheep's clothing. Diers's principal aim was to highlight the parallels between images and slogans as metonymic depictions of political ideas and events, in particular, endowing them with an 'elevated emotional value'.[2]

The term 'Schlagbild' was originally coined by Aby Warburg in an essay on propaganda during the Reformation, and the mobilization of the term was part of a wider renewal of interest in Warburg's work led by Martin Warnke, whose student Diers had been.[3] Indeed, the political implications of Warburg's term were first discussed by Warnke nearly twenty years earlier, and the groundwork for Diers's volume was subsequently laid by the establishment, in 1991, of the research project in 'Political Iconography' ('Forschungsstelle Politische Ikonographie') at the Institute of Art History

---

[1] Michael Diers, *Schlagbilder: Zur politischen Ikonographie der Gegenwart* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997).

[2] Diers, *Schlagbilder*, 7. Diers is citing Otto Ladendorf, *Historisches Schlagwörterbuch: Ein Versuch* (Berlin, 1906).

[3] Aby Warburg, 'Heidnisch-antike Weissagung in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten', (1921) in Warburg, *Ausgewählte Schriften und Würdigungen*, ed. by Dieter Wuttke (Baden Baden, 3rd edn., 1992) 232. English translation: 'Pagan-Antique Prophecy in Words and Images in the Age of Luther', in Warburg, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity*, trans. David Britt (Los Angeles, CA, 1999) 622.

of the University of Hamburg.[4] Initially an archive of visual documenta-
tion (today grown to half a million reproductions) in which the slide hold-
ings of the Institute were in part reorganized according to social, cultural
and political themes, the project also led to the publication of a number
of texts on the iconology of politics. Subjects included the postcard as a
medium of propaganda, the political functions of architecture, and images
of terror in the wake of the 2001 attacks on the World Trade Centre.[5]

Diers's volume was a clear illustration of the attempts to translate the
revived interest in Aby Warburg in Germany in the 1990s into a frame-
work for future research. Warburg significantly extended the scope of tra-
ditional art history; under the banner of the history and theory of culture
('Kulturwissenschaft') he embraced the study not only of works of high
art, but also photography, scientific and astrological imagery, heraldry,
photojournalism and stamps. Moreover, as Otto Werckmeister has indi-
cated, the interest in his legacy came at a significant moment in German
art history. Following the decline of the radical art history of the 1970s,
the discipline appeared to have lost direction, and the reassessment of
Warburg opened up new possibilities.[6] A number of different lines of
enquiry were explored; for some commentators, most notably, Georges
Didi-Huberman, Warburg provided a basis for a polemical attack on some
of the basic epistemological assumptions of traditional art history.[7]

The 'rediscovery' of Warburg constitutes an important chapter in the
history of the reception of his work, but it was also a significant episode
in a larger process that has taken place in German-language scholarship
over the past two decades: the shift beyond an exclusive concern with art
towards the wider analysis of images. Although this could be observed
across a number of disciplines, including the emergence of media theory
('Medienwissenschaft') as a distinct discipline, this chapter is concerned

---

[4] Martin Warnke, 'Schlagbilder und Bilderfahrzeuge', in *Die Menschenrechte des Auges:
Über Aby Warburg*, ed. Werner Hofmann, Georg Syamken and Martin Warnke (Frankfurt
am Main, 1980) 75–83.

[5] See Elisabeth von Hagenow, *Politik und Bild: Die Postkarte als Medium der Propaganda*
(Hamburg, 1994); Hermann Hipp and Ernst Seidl, eds., *Architektur als politische Kultur—
Philosophia Practica* (Berlin, 1996); Michael Beuthner, Joachim Buttler, Sandra Fröhlich,
Irene Neverla, and Stephan A. Weichert, eds., *Bilder des Terrors—Terror der Bilder? Krisen-
berichterstattung am und nach dem 11. September* (Cologne, 2003).

[6] Otto Karl Werckmeister, 'The Turn from Marx to Warburg in West German Art His-
tory 1968–1990', in *Marxism and the History of Art: From William Morris to the New Left*, ed.
Andrew Hemmingway (London, 2006) 213–20.

[7] Georges Didi-Huberman, *L'image survivante: Histoire de l'art et temps des fantômes
selon Aby Warburg* (Paris, 2002).

specifically with the rise of 'Bildwissenschaft' ('image theory'). In certain respects there are parallels with developments in Britain and America; the engagement with notions of visual culture by authors such as John Walker and Nicholas Mirzoeff exhibited a similar ambition to challenge the methodological (and political) presuppositions of art history.[8] There are, however, important differences, which will be explored shortly. Furthermore, while the term 'Bildwissenschaft' has gained increased currency, examination of its various definitions indicates a heterogeneous and disunified field that encompasses widely divergent and often competing interests and approaches. The fluid identity of the field is all too evident in a recent attempt to provide a genealogy that names as progenitors of modern 'Bildwissenschaft' such diverse figures as Gilles Deleuze, Aby Warburg, Carl Justi, the political theorist Carl Schmitt, Pierre Bourdieu and Paul Feyerabend.[9]

   The term 'Bildwissenschaft' was first used by Klaus Sachs-Hombach in an anthology of writings on the psychology and semantics of the image. Entitled *Image—Image Perception—Image Processing. Interdisciplinary Contributions to the Theory of the Image*, the volume was part of a longer-term enquiry by Sachs-Hombach into the cognitive functions of the image, starting with historical work on nineteenth-century psychology.[10] Initially Sachs-Hombach was concerned with purely theoretical questions to do with the psychology of cognition, involving a particular interest on mental imagining.[11] However, he gradually shifted focus from the image in internal cognitive processes towards consideration of visual imagery as a communicative medium and the question of visual interpretation.

   His most extended discussion of this theme was his 2005 volume *Das Bild als kommunikatives Medium* ('The Image as a Communicative Medium'), a general theoretical inquiry into pictorial representation.[12] At its heart is a

---

   [8] John Walker and Sarah Chaplin, *Visual Culture. An Introduction* (Manchester, 1997); Nicholas Mirzoeff, *An Introduction to Visual Culture* (London, 1999). Keith Moxey has also examined parallels between the anglophone and the German situation in 'Visual Studies and the Iconic Turn', 7.2 (2008) 131–46.

   [9] Jörg Probst and Jost Phillip Klenner, eds., *Ideengeschichte der Bildwissenschaft: Siebzehn Porträts* (Frankfurt am Main, 2009).

   [10] Klaus Sachs-Hombach and Klaus Rehkämper, eds., *Bild- Bildwahrnehmung- Bildverarbeitung* (Magdeburg, 1998). See, too, Sachs-Hombach, *Philosophische Psychologie im 19. Jahrhundert: Ihre Entstehung und Problemgeschichte* (Freiburg, 1993).

   [11] See, for example, Klaus Sachs-Hombach, ed., *Bilder im Geiste: Zur kognitiven und erkenntnistheoretischen Funktion piktorialer Repräsentationen* (Amsterdam, 1995).

   [12] Klaus Sachs-Hombach, *Das Bild als kommunikatives Medium: Elemente einer allgemeinen Bildwissenschaft* (Köln, 2005).

response to semiotics, and in particular, the semiotic notion of the analogy between image and text. Despite the many parallels, Sachs-Hombach insisted on the substantial differences, which resist the easy transfer of semiotics to visual representations. For example, he put forward the now familiar argument that within an image there is nothing that might correspond to the syntax or grammar of a language. Although certain genres of image may have a basic vocabulary of forms and certain combinatorial rules—the symbolic forms and combinations long ago identified by iconological analysis—they cannot be compared to the far more complex syntactical and grammatical structure of a language. Similarly, Sachs-Hombach argued that images cannot be said to have the illocutionary or perlocutionary force that specific classes of linguistic utterance have. Ultimately, too, as physical artefacts, images address and depend on the perceptual competencies of the spectator, which provides pictorial meaning with a dimension which semiotic theory struggles to account for. Moreover, he argued, semiotics is open to the charge of excessive formalism; it identifies the mechanisms of meaning-generation, but fails to account for the pragmatics of pictorial interpretation, the fact that images become meaningful in particular situations and not solely on the basis of the *intra*-textual shifting play of visual signifiers.

Although attempting to establish an interdisciplinary focus for research, Sachs-Hombach's work has had little impact on other disciplines and, in particular, on art historians or historians engaged with visual material. In part this is due to the abstract generalities of his concerns, in part, however, it is also because it is difficult to see how his version of 'Bildwissenschaft' could provide a new field of study. While he correctly lays bare some of the weaknesses of visual semiotics, the latter has proven influential, not on the basis of its theoretical rigour, but due to its provision of a suggestive framework of interpretative freedom to which many were drawn when faced with its alternative: the orthodoxies of humanistic art history. Furthermore, semiotics has flourished within visual studies due to the ease with which it could be adapted to serve other politically and socially committed approaches; Roland Barthes had already indicated the mutual interplay of semiotics and Marxist cultural critique in *Mythologies* in the 1950s.[13] In contrast, Sachs-Hombach replaced such political engagement with a more purely theoretical concern to do with philosophies of representation and meaning.

---

[13] Roland Barthes, *Mythologies* (Paris, 1957).

Sachs-Hombach's work is a notable illustration—if only due to his prolific publication rate—of one particular understanding of the meaning of the term 'Bildwissenschaft', that sees it mostly in terms of purely theoretical issues of cognition and, subsequently, models of interpretation.[14] A rather different interpretation of the meaning of such a theoretical attention to image was evident in an anthology published in 1994, *Was ist ein Bild?* ('What is an Image?'), edited by the Basel-based art historian Gottfried Boehm.[15] Boehm's volume emerged out of an engagement with traditions of aesthetics; authors included philosophers such as Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Hans Jonas and Arthur Danto, but it also contained writings by art historians for whom aesthetic questions had been central preoccupations. These included Meyer Schapiro, Kurt Bauch and Max Imdahl.

The volume did not attempt to present a unified theory of the image; the ideas of the authors were too heterogeneous. Danto was writing from the position of Anglo-American analytic aesthetics, the Schapiro text was a translation of his essay on semiotics and art history, while there were also excerpts from Jacques Lacan's *Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis.* On the other hand, with one or two exceptions, a common theme was a concern with the phenomenology of viewing and pictorial representing. A recurring issue was the question of medium; Imdahl's notion of the 'iconic' ('Ikonik') stressed the specificity of pictorial semantics, the fact that the 'image is a conveying of meaning that cannot be replaced by anything else'.[16] Studying biblical narratives in Ottonian miniatures and Giotto's Arena chapel, as well as work by Ruisdael and others, Imdahl analysed the meaning structures dependent solely on the visuality of the image, such as composition and the construction of pictorial space.

Boehm's anthology could be seen as paralleling the 'return' to aesthetics in anglophone scholarship, in which the irreducibility of the aesthetic dimension was reclaimed in the face of critiques by feminist and Marxist

---

[14] In addition to the works cited, Sachs-Hombach is also author of *Bildtheorien: Anthropologische und kulturelle Grundlagen des Visualistic Turn* (Frankfurt am Main, 2009) and editor of, amongst others, *Bildwissenschaft: Disziplinen, Themen, Methoden* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005), *Bild und Medium: Kunstgeschichtliche und philosophische Grundlagen der interdisziplinären Bildwissenschaft* (Cologne, 2009) and co-editor, with Klaus Rehkämper, of *Bildgrammatik: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Syntax bildlicher Darstellungsformen* (Cologne, 1999).

[15] Gottfried Boehm, ed., *Was ist ein Bild?* (Munich, 1994).

[16] Max Imdahl, 'Ikonik: Bilder und ihre Anschauung', in Boehm, *Was ist ein Bild?*, 300. The chapter was taken from Imdahl's monograph *Giotto: Arenafresken: Ikonographie, Ikonologie, Ikonik* (Münster, 1980).

art historians in the 1980s.[17] Thus Boehm's own contribution focused on the concept of 'iconic difference'. By this he meant 'the limitations of the medium. The image we encounter rests on a fundamental contrast between its surface that can be perceived as a single totality and all the individual events it encompasses.' The iconic difference is thus 'the relation between the visible totality of the image and manifold wealth of what it depicts'.[18] The variable configurations of this relation constitute the history of the image, and provide a framework for tracing the history of painting. Modernist painting in particular problematized this relation, and Boehm examined examples such as the simultaneist paintings of Robert Delaunay, the drawings on glass of Marcel Duchamp, or the abstract work of Mark Rothko, all of which offer novel ways of exhibiting and problematizing the phenomenon of iconic difference. Rothko, for example, 'develops iconic contrasts, which recall the structure of the image within the image. Inner surfaces re-enact the surface of the picture as a whole, adjusted proportionally. Colour becomes organized as a sequence of semi-transparent layers. It is articulated according to the logic of disappearance intrinsic to the non-reality of all painting. The very first trace of colour, that first layer of a representation, which some unknown painter in dim pre-historic times may have applied, both negated the image ground and also brought it back to prominence.'[19]

The notion of 'iconic difference' was informed by themes drawn from aesthetics, but Boehm was concerned to employ it as a tool of historical analysis; although not treating it as the master-concept for a new, formalistic, history of art, he was nevertheless concerned with its differing socio-historical inflections. His interests, however, were with the image in its widest possible sense, rather than with the artwork; this wider approach was evident in the *eikones* research centre Boehm subsequently established in Basel.[20] With the full title of *National Centre of Competence in Research* (*NCCR*) *Iconic Criticism* ('Nationale Forschungsschwerpunkt (NFS) Bildkritik') the Centre, which operates a graduate school and an ambitious programme of research publications, has sponsored a range

---

[17] The best known critique was Victor Burgin's *The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Postmodernity* (London, 1986). On the renewed interest in aesthetics see Dave Beech and John Roberts, eds., *The Philistine Controversy* (London, 2002) and John Joughin and Simon Malpas, eds., *The New Aestheticism* (Manchester, 2004).

[18] Boehm, 'Die Wiederkehr der Bilder', in Boehm, ed., *Was ist ein Bild?*, 29f.

[19] Boehm, 'Die Bilderfrage', in Boehm, ed., *Was ist ein Bild?*, 340.

[20] See the website: http://www.eikones.ch/eikones/introduction.html?L=1 (accessed 6 May 2010).

of research projects common to which are the basic questions: 'How do images create meaning—in science, in everyday life or in the arts? How are they influenced by them and how, conversely, do they influence them? What is their inherent vital power?'[21]

The thematic foci of the Centre have been deliberately wide-ranging, but it is notable that as with Boehm's earlier anthology, image theory has not been conceived in opposition to art history. A recent workshop held at the Centre was devoted to conceptions of the image operative within art historical scholarship.[22] This marks an important difference between the so-called 'iconic turn' in Germany and the rise of Anglo-American studies.[23] This difference, despite important areas of commonality, is evident in texts such as Gernot Böhme's *Theorie des Bildes* ('Theory of the Image').[24] Böhme traces a history of the theory of the image, beginning with the ontology outlined in Plato's *Republic*. In particular, Böhme traces the gradual inversion of this ontology; where for Plato the image was always dependent on some original, it has, by the end of the twentieth century, taken on a reality of its own. Indeed, the image has become a measure of reality: 'By means of the image, reality steps out of itself, it becomes more definite, more decisive, more pregnant with meaning, and in this sense more real. Only in the picture does it become something distinct, out of the manifold ways it might reveal itself and which, in the first instance, remain indistinct and diffuse.'[25] Reality now only becomes meaningful, argues Böhme, through being pictured. No longer a *reflection* of reality, the image has taken on its own existence and stands over the real. The culmination of this process is the digital era where, converted into a binary code of 0s and 1s, the image is no longer even dependent on a specific medium. Its last mooring in extrinsic reality has been lost. This last claim is, of course, disputable; the hard disk of a computer or the USB-data stick is just as much a medium as a sheet of canvas or paper, and its capacities and limitations determine the properties of the digital image. However, what is of greater interest here, perhaps, is that Böhme comes to

---

[21] Publications include: Gottfried Boehm and Sebastian Egenhofer, eds., *Zeigen: Die Rhetorik des Sichtbaren* (Munich, 2010); Alexander Honold and Ralf Simon, eds., *Das Erzählende und das Erzählte Bild* (Munich, 2010).

[22] *Bildbegriffe der Kunstgeschichte: Epistemologische Bestandsaufnahme*, held 6–7 May 2010.

[23] The notion of an iconic turn was suggested in Christa Maar and Hubert Burda, eds., *Iconic Turn: Die neue Macht der Bilder* (Cologne, 2004).

[24] Gernot Böhme, *Theorie des Bildes* (Munich, 1999).

[25] Böhme, *Theorie des Bildes*, 92.

a strikingly similar conclusion to writers such as Nicholas Mirzoeff or Guy Debord.[26] Yet where they both place this altered ontology of the image firmly within the context of wider social theories of the spectacle and late capitalist consumption—this being Debord's central thesis—Böhme avoids taking up such socio-political threads.

The work of Böhme and Boehm has been driven by an engagement with discourses in aesthetics. A rather different conception of 'Bildwissenschaft' was formulated by the Karlsruhe-based art historian Hans Belting; his book *Bildanthropologie* ('Anthropology of the Image'), with the subtitle *Entwürfe für eine Bildwissenschaft* ('Essays towards a Science of the Image') attempted to formulate an anthropological theory of the image in order to analyse its universal, trans-cultural, functions.[27] The basis of this is the idea that, as Belting states, the image is a double of the body: 'a change in the experience of the image is the expression of a change in the experience of the body. For this reason the cultural history of the image is reflected in the cultural history of the body.'[28] His analysis gave particular importance to certain types of image, ranging from death-masks to effigies, *moulages*, portraits, which he regarded as paradigms of the universal concern of the image with historicity, death and the body. To cite Belting: 'The image of the dead is no anomaly but rather the primal meaning of the image *per se*. The dead are always absent, death an unbearable absence that one fills with the image in order to render it bearable.'[29]

Although it coincided with the projects described earlier, this was the culmination of a twenty year project, namely, a cultural history of the image, in which Belting had examined the meaning of the image in cultic and religious contexts. His goal was to restore to images what he deemed their originary non-art function. His studies of medieval art, in particular, set out to de-aestheticize their objects; thus, *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages* focused on the role of devotional imagery—specifically the *imago pietatis*—in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[30] His monumental study of Byzantine icons and their migration to Europe analysed their liturgical function and, crucially, their mimetic representational

---

[26] Nicholas Mirzoeff, *An Introduction to Visual Culture* (London, 1999); Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson Smith (New York, 1994).

[27] Hans Belting, *Bild-Anthropologie: Entwürfe für eine Bildwissenschaft* (Munich, 2001).

[28] Belting, *Bild-Anthropologie*, 23.

[29] Belting, *Bild-Anthropologie*, 144.

[30] Hans Belting, *Das Bild und sein Publikum im Mittelalter: Form und Funktion früher Bildtafeln der Passion* (Berlin, 1981).

logic in an era prior to the invention of art, which he dated to the early sixteenth century.[31] Indeed, Belting's concern with the image in general rather than with artworks, was linked to his view that 'art' had emerged as a cultural construct that *hindered* corporeal engagement with the image. In particular, art, with its fetish of the invisible masterpiece, has served to alienate the image from the body.[32]

Belting was not the first to have adopted such an approach; the idea of the cultic origin of images became widespread during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and was supported both by specialist historians of prehistoric art and also by cultural critics from Walter Benjamin to Georges Bataille. Yet his was the first attempt to integrate such speculation into the historical study of the image. His earlier studies of medieval art could be accommodated within traditional art history, but *Anthropology of the Image* explicitly dissociates itself from art historical enquiry. Indeed, Belting states that 'it is the purpose of the set of questions outlined here to liberate our concept of the image from the narrow and traditional patterns of thought in which it is imprisoned in the different academic fields and disciplines.'[33] Consequently his essays consider not only artworks, but also medical images, photographs and cyberspace imagery, and they ask questions to do with the meaning of the image which art history is allegedly not able to answer.

Belting's work opened up important new territory. An important aspect of his study of medieval imagery and image-response was the topic of iconoclasm, and he extended this concern with his involvement in the exhibition *Iconoclash* held at Karlsruhe in 2002.[34] Accompanied by a substantial book edited by Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel, *Iconoclash* mirrored Belting's involvement in the broader field of the image through extending the traditional subject matter of discussions of iconoclasm (religious icons, political imagery, avant-garde practices) into areas such as scientific and mathematical diagrams.[35] The connection with Belting's anthropology of

---

[31] Hans Belting, *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (Munich, 1990).

[32] Hans Belting, *Das Unsichtbare Meisterwerk: Die modernen Mythen der Kunst* (Munich, 1998).

[33] Belting, *Bild-Anthropologie*, 55.

[34] The exhibition was held at Belting's institution, the Centre for Art and Media (ZKM) at the Karlsruhe Academy of Design (Hochschule für Gestaltung).

[35] Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel, eds., *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2002). On mathematical and scientific imagery see, for example, Peter Galison's article, 'Images Scatter into Data, Data Gather into Images' in Latour and Weibel, eds., *Iconoclash*, 300–23.

the image was evident, too, in the definition of 'iconoclash' as an 'anthropology' of the iconoclastic urge, resisting its drive to destroy the 'merely' man-made with the idea that 'the more images, mediations, intermediaries, icons are multiplied and overtly fabricated, explicitly and publicly constructed, the more respect we have for their capacities to welcome, gather, to recollect truth and sanctity.'[36]

An ambitious attempt to move beyond the paradigm of art history, Belting's anthropology of the image suffered a number of weaknesses. While claiming to present a meta-theoretical account of the image, it was significantly undertheorized; the use of such a wide range of material undermined its theoretical coherence. Moreover the privileging of certain kinds of image—death masks, effigies, *moulages*, portraits—as paradigmatic of *all* images, was open to the charge of arbitrariness. There is no historical or theoretical ground underpinning his decision to take the face masks of 'so-called primitive peoples' as the prototype of all images.[37] Indeed, this was reminiscent of the fascination with Polynesian facial tattoos that art historians such as Alois Riegl had displayed more than a century ago.[38] Thus, his inquiry into the trans-historical basis of images relies on an essentialist logic that runs counter to the predominant contemporary concern with the cultural and historical specificity of images. Belting was thereby revisiting motifs more common in art-historical writing of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In addition to Riegl one might mention in this context Aby Warburg's historical anthropology of the Renaissance or Julius von Schlosser's study of wax portraiture.[39] This sense of an affinity with an earlier period of scholarship is strengthened in a more recent text in which Belting draws on themes from empathy theory to account for the relation between the image and the body.[40] It is notable that despite his assertion that 'the question of the image is anthropological in nature', his writings contain little mention of more recent approaches to the anthropology of art.[41]

---

[36] Latour and Weibel, eds., *Iconoclash*, 7.

[37] Belting, *Bild-Anthropologie*, 35.

[38] See Alois Riegl, *Problems of Style*, trans. Evelyn Kain (Princeton, NJ, 1992).

[39] Julius von Schlosser, *Tote Blicke: Geschichte der Porträtbildnerei in Wachs* (Berlin, 1993). Schlosser's text was first published in 1910/11.

[40] Belting states: 'Our willingness to create symbols can be characterized as the belief in images. It is based on the symbolic act we call animation . . . [which is] an inborn ability of our bodies (although it can be learnt) to discover in inanimate images life, which we ourselves give them.' See Belting, 'Blickwechsel mit Bildern. Die Bildfrage als Körperfrage', in Belting, ed., *Bilderfragen* (Munich, 2007) 50.

[41] Belting, 'Die Herausforderung der Bilder: Ein Plädoyer und eine Einführung', in Belting, ed., *Bilderfragen*, 15.

There are few parallels in francophone or anglophone scholarship to this project; the closest is the work of David Freedberg, whose *The Power of Images* studied the history of image response by drawing on anthropological motifs.[42] Like Belting, Freedberg argued for attention to historical sources that attested to a wide range of non-aesthetic responses to images, from extreme violence, to fear, and devotion. Like Belting, however, Freedberg's work lacked a clear theoretical underpinning.

Belting saw his version of 'Bildwissenschaft' as pursuing themes that had lain beyond the purview of traditional art history. This raises the broader question of the relation between the two fields. As noted above, it has in many cases been fraught with tensions; however exponents of German image theory have seldom adopted the antagonistic stance towards art history of the kind visible in Anglo-American visual studies. This partly reflects the fact that many authors were drawn to 'Bildwissenschaft' from other fields (i.e. they were not art-historical 'malcontents'). Some commentators, such as Horst Bredekamp, have even highlighted points of convergence between the two.[43] Some of Bredekamp's work bears out this claim; his analysis of the *Wunderkammer*, for example, which examined the place of art collecting within the broader epistemic regime of the Renaissance, was ultimately a disquisition on the prehistory of art and the aesthetic.[44] As Bredekamp argues, although there existed in the Renaissance a categorical distinction between artworks and other kinds of natural and artificial phenomena, it was not until the Enlightenment that a specific discourse of art emerged that was incommensurable with those of the natural sciences, politics or ethics.

Bredekamp's goal was to overcome this Enlightenment legacy by exploring the possibilities of a discourse that would cross the science/art boundary, which was a coded plea for the instauration of a field dedicated to the wider study of the image. Later work by Bredekamp exemplifies this notion; his short study on Darwin's use of the image of coral as a visual metaphor for the evolutionary development of animals and plants

---

[42] David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago, IL, 1989).

[43] Horst Bredekamp, 'A Neglected Tradition? Art History as *Bildwissenschaft*', in *The Art Historian: National Traditions and Institutional Practices*, ed. Michael F. Zimmermann (London and New Haven, CT, 2003) 147–59. See, too, Bredekamp, 'Bildwissenschaft', in *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft: Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe*, ed. Ulrich Pfisterer (Stuttgart, 2003) 56–8.

[44] Horst Bredekamp, *Antikensehnsucht und Maschinenglauben: Die Geschichte der Kunstkammer und die Zukunft der Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin, 1993).

is one such case.[45] Prior to the publication of *The Origin of Species* in 1859 numerous differing visual models had been used in the construction of visual taxonomies of living organisms and their development, including trees, ladders, crystallographic and annular diagrams. As Bredekamp notes, however, Darwin returned repeatedly to the *amphiroa orbignyana*, a species of coral he had collected on the voyage of HMS Beagle in 1834. This provided him not only with a means of visualizing his growing idea of the evolution of species; it also satisfied the aesthetic imperatives driving his natural history. In *The Structure and Distribution of Coral Reefs*, for example, he had employed the category of the sublime to describe the immensity of the reefs and the time taken for their development.[46] Yet the coral motif was not adduced after the fact, to illustrate the theory of evolution; rather, the latter was shaped to fit the image. As Bredekamp states, 'The struggle for the survival of species, which was symbolized in the interplay of point and line, letter and number, became a medium for the explanation of the system in itself. Darwin's idea could not be grasped without the image . . . The image became the true nature of evolution. Darwin formulated his theory of evolution not as a description of nature, but as the commentary to a diagram.'[47] Thus, against the traditional hierarchy of the verbal over the visual, Bredekamp argued that the latter plays a crucial role not only in the process of scientific induction (i.e. the formulation of general laws on the basis of observed individual empirical data) but also as the driver of deductive scientific reasoning. Visual imagery can be as powerful a tool of scientific investigation as conceptual models and theories.

Bredekamp's work exemplifies a marked strand of research within 'Bildwissenschaft' that focuses on the cognitive functions of the image in the sciences. Subsequent publications have explored the possibility of a stylistic history of scientific imagery, or examined the role of visual argumentation during the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century.[48] To promote this field of research, Bredekamp co-founded the Hermann von Helmholtz

---

[45] Horst Bredekamp, *Darwins Korallen: Frühe Evolutionsmodelle und die Tradition der Naturgeschichte* (Berlin, 2005).

[46] Charles Darwin, 'The Structure and Distribution of Coral Reefs', in *The Works of Charles Darwin*, vol. 7, ed. Paul Barrett and Peter Gautrey (London, 1986).

[47] Bredekamp, *Darwins Korallen*, 75–6.

[48] See Horst Bredekamp, Birgit Schneider, and Vera Dünkel, eds., *Das technische Bild: Kompendium für eine Stilgeschichte wissenschaftlicher Bilder* (Berlin, 2008); Bredekamp, ed., *Visuelle Argumentationen: Die Mysterien der Repräsentation und die Berechenbarkeit der Welt* (Munich, 2005).

Centre for Culture and Technology ('Hermann von Helmholtz-Zentrum für Kulturtechnik') in Berlin. The Centre publishes the journal *Bildwelten des Wissens*, which has examined topics such as technical diagrams, the use of colour, scientific instruments or images of abstract systems.

There are parallel examples in English, such as David Freedberg's study of the image in Galileo, Brian Ford's more general history of scientific illustration, or work on scientific representation by Barbara Stafford or Lorraine Daston.[49] Such a comparison throws up important differences as well, however. Like much work in Anglo-American visual studies, Stafford's writings are shaped by the paradigm of cultural studies, central to which is the concern with the politics of representation and the distribution of social power. Informed by Foucault's work on epistemic regimes, Stafford treats the scientific image as an instrument of knowledge-power.[50]

Such concerns are mostly absent in Bredekamp's work, which displays an apolitical concern with the cognitive function of scientific imagery.[51] Another example of this kind of research is Olaf Breidbach's *Bilder des Wissens*, which analyses the role of observation in the history of scientific method, and the interplay between scientific observation and visual representation.[52] Breidbach's aim is the critique of empiricist theories of scientific method, with an emphasis on the cultural relativity of observation, including the idea of objectivity itself. This, he argues, is the product of a rationality that has transformed the human subject into a technical observing machine.

Such a theoretical claim is now hardly novel, but Breidbach supports it with concrete historical examples, from Galileo's observations of the velocity of falling objects, to William Harvey's discovery of the blood circulation system, or the bacteriological researches of Robert Koch in the

---

[49] David Freedberg, *The Eye of the Lynx: Galileo, his Friends and the Beginnings of Modern Natural History* (Chicago, IL, 2003); Brian Ford, *Images of Science: A History of Scientific Illustration* (London, 1992); Barbara Maria Stafford, *Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine* (Cambridge, MA, 1993); Lorrain Daston and Katherin Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150–1750* (New York, 1998).

[50] See, for example, Barbara Maria Stafford, *Artful Science: Enlightenment Entertainment and the Eclipse of Visual Education* (Cambridge, MA, 1996). Foucault's *Les Mots et les Choses* (Paris, 1966) translated into English as *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London, 1974) has played an enormously influential role here, as has his work *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York, 1977).

[51] One exception is Bernd Hüppauf and Peter Weingart, eds., *Frosch und Frankenstein: Bilder als Medium der Popularisierung von Wissenschaft* (Bielefeld, 2009). The essays in this volume address the image of science in popular culture, from public debates about, for example, nanotechnology, to fictional representations in film and other media.

[52] Olaf Breidbach, *Bilder des Wissens: Zur Kulturgeschichte der wissenschaftlichen Wahrnehmung* (Munich, 2005).

1880s. As Breidbach states in regard to the latter, 'the reality of the image in a tunnel microscope is an artefact, a reconstruction given the form of an image, a projection of the equipment', and later, 'the reality of the measurements constituting this image is produced from *within* the image and then projected onto a reality that is apparently reproduced in the image.'[53] With this tortuous rhetoric Breidbach is attempting to convey the circularity of the relation between representation, observation and scientific measurement. The prior conception of nature as representable as an image determines the kinds of measurements and observations that will be deemed relevant, and which then feed back into the understanding of nature. As Breidbach later adds, observation is not only shaped by the wider conceptual presuppositions of the observer, but also by the physical apparatus used.[54]

This account is broadly accepted by philosophers of science, but Breidbach's book is important in its application of such theoretical insights to a wide range of historical examples. It also examines the role of the image in the construction of scientific knowledge; this is illustrated by the well-known controversy surrounding Ernst Haeckel's *General Morphology of Organisms* of 1866.[55] An avid Darwinian, Haeckel claimed that ontogenesis of the embryo in the womb or egg mimicked the evolutionary development of its species. Controversy arose due to his use of illustrations. Specifically, he included images of the embryos of a dog, a hen and a tortoise, in order to demonstrate their common development of all three. It emerged, however, that Haeckel had falsified the images to strengthen his argument. The case raised the wider issue as to the legitimacy of visual material as the basis of scientific argument. This was already questioned in the 1920s by the philosopher Hans Vaihinger, who focused on the role of the individual as a metonymic representative of the species.[56] This relies on a schematization based not on empirical observation, but on abstracted types. Vaihinger was primarily interested

----

[53] Breidbach, *Bilder des Wissens*, 88.

[54] This was also explored by Edgar Wind in his habilitation on the relation between scientific investigation and metaphysical presuppositions about nature. Originally published in 1934, it was republished as Edgar Wind, *Das Experiment und die Metaphysik: Zur Auflösung der kosmologischen Antinomien*, ed. Bernhard Buschendorf (Frankfurt am Main, 2000). On Wind see Pablo Schneider, 'Begriffliches Denken—verkörpertes Sehen: Edgar Wind (1900–1971)' in *Ideengeschichte der Bildwissenschaft: Siebzehn Porträt*s, ed. Jörg Probst and Jost Philipp Klenner (Frankfurt am Main, 2009) 53–74.

[55] Ernst Haeckel, *Generelle Morphologie der Organismen* (Berlin, 1866).

[56] Hans Vaihinger, *Die Philosophie des als ob* (Leipzig, 1927) 36ff.

in the role of *conceptual* schemata in the construction of scientific knowledge, but for Breidbach images function as equally powerful instruments of schematization. 'It is not enough simply to observe; the observations have to be located within a grid, according to a pre-determined model.'[57] The clearest examples of such schematization are the taxonomic tables pioneered by Carl Linnaeus, which provided a visual matrix in which specific visual characteristics are privileged as markers of identity. Indeed, until the discovery of DNA in the 1950s and subsequent developments in genetics, the primary means for species differentiation was observation of visual similarities and differences. For Breidbach, cases such as Haeckel or Linnaeus demonstrate the complex relation between image, observation and conceptualization. Observations are dependent on prior theoretical models, but such models are themselves shaped by visual resemblances that are in turn framed by visual schemata.

Concluding Comments

The rise of 'Bildwissenschaft' can be seen, on the one hand, as part of a wider process occurring not only in Germany, but also in Anglophone scholarship, in France and, more recently, Spain and Italy.[58] On the other hand, while notions of an 'iconic turn' or 'visual turn' clearly have applicability, this is so only in the most general sense of a shift away from art history as the master discourse governing interpretation and analysis of the image. A brief comparison of visual studies with 'Bildwissenschaft' throws up as many differences as similarities; the emergence of visual studies was in important respects a continuation of the struggle of cultural studies against the political quiescence of the traditional humanities disciplines in the 1960s. Its understanding of the discipline as defined not by a specific object domain but by its conceptual, methodological and political approach, is the result of a dynamic that is completely absent in the literature of 'Bildwissenschaft'. Although writers such as Bredekamp

---

[57] Breidbach, *Bilder des Wissens*, 152.
[58] In Spain the journal *Estudios Visuales* was founded in 2003. Other important projects have included José Luis Brea, ed., *Estudios visuales. La epistemología de la visualidad en la era de la globalización* (Madrid, 2005) and the translation of Nicholas Mirzoeff, *Una introducción a la cultura visual*, trans. Paula García Segura (Madrid, 2003). See Antonio Somaini, ed., *Il luogo dello spettatore: Forme dello sguardo nella cultura delle immagini* (Milan, 2005). Mirzoeff's text was translated into Italian as *Introduzione alla cultura visuale* (Rome, 2005).

and Diers embraced the wider theory of the image in part due to disaffection with the state of art history in the 1980s, there has been none of the aggressive distancing from the discipline that has characterized some exponents of visual studies.

The term 'Bildwissenschaft' is increasingly gaining currency as the denominator of a new set of theoretical discourses within Germany, Switzerland and Austria.[59] Yet as the analysis of the various authors here examined indicates, even here it is misleading to think in terms of a single unified field. Their diverse points of origin, and their differing understandings of its scope and nature, foreground rather more the pluralistic character of 'Bildwissenschaft'.

Given the constant exchange of ideas across linguistic, national and disciplinary boundaries, these distinct bodies of thinking may eventually overlap and converge. What is clear at present, however, is that talk of 'visual theory' in the singular is misleading, in that it masks important differences between discourses, values and approaches shaped by national and linguistically mediated traditions of intellectual inquiry.

---

[59] This is evident in the significant number of 'introductions' to the field published recently; see, for example, Elize Bisanz, *Die Überwindung des Ikonischen: Kulturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven der Bildwissenschaft* (Bielefeld, 2010); Martin Schulz, *Ordnungen der Bilder: Eine Einführung in die Bildwissenschaft* (Munich, 2009); Gustav Frank and Barbara Lange, *Einführung in die Bildwissenschaft: Bilder in der visuellen Kultur* (Darmstadt, 2010).

COMPUTERIZATION, DIGITIZATION AND THE INTERNET[1]

Antonella Sbrilli

Introduction

In the past three decades, the use of computer-based technologies in the many fields of scholarship, research, communication and education has seen an unprecedented development. As far as art history and visual studies are concerned, there has been an exponential increase in studies and applications, local experiences and international projects aimed at exploring the intersection of these fields and digital tools and at remarking the critical points of this relationship.

Innovations that emerged during the 1980s and 1990s are by now widely accepted; concepts such as hypertext and link, *immatériaux* and multimedia, 3D and virtual restoration, e-learning and folksonomy have entered the lexicon of art historians, while huge digital archives have been implemented and search engines refined. At present, high-quality digital reproductions of artworks enable one to have at one's disposal accurate zoomable facsimiles, in some cases even showing details not visible to the naked eye on the originals; they can be enhanced by data regarding their context, can be altered and deconstructed. Above all, digital reproductions make it possible to collect together the *disiecta membra* of artists' production, which can be compared, analysed, and computed in many different ways, in a mutual exchange of philology and informatics, enabling each scholar to build his or her own *musée imaginaire*, as conceived by André Malraux.[2]

In the meantime, international organizations have been working to establish standards, protocols, templates, and metadata in order to build a useful and effective digital *koine* while trying to face important problems, such as recognizing reliable resources among the information overload and preventing the same resources from becoming obsolete.

---

[1] The author thanks Nicolette Mandarano, Valerio Eletti (Sapienza University of Rome) and Robert E. Iannazzi for their reading of the text, and Gloria Pasqualetto (Fondazione Cini, Venice) for her courtesy.

[2] André Malraux, *Museum without Walls*, trans. Stuart Gilbert and Francis Price (Garden City, N.Y., 1967). First published in French in 1965.

The state of the art of digitization of cultural heritage in Europe is monitored and promoted by the European Community Minerva Project, a network aimed to 'harmonize activities carried out in digitization of cultural and scientific content for creating an agreed European common platform, recommendations and guidelines about digitization, metadata, long-term accessibility and preservation'.[3] A further European project will be of enormous importance: 'Europeana, Europe's digital library, museum and archive'.[4] When completely implemented, it will offer a prototype multilingual website giving users direct access to the digitized archives of a network of cultural institutions, containing collections of books, paintings, photographs, sounds, films, manuscripts and other documents regarded as cultural heritage.

The three purposes of the application of informatics, documentary, editorial and hermeneutic—which were clearly lined out by the Italian Jesuit priest, Father Roberto Busa, a pioneer of computational linguistics—can also be recognized in the field of art history and visual studies.[5] As a matter of fact, computerization, digitization and the Internet have not only impacted on 'normal' activities such as reproducing images, cataloguing and filing data, editing and publishing documents, and preserving and diffusing knowledge about art, they have also projected, in some cases, new lines of research. Looking at the past, the use of new technologies has caused analogies and continuities to emerge, stressing some features of traditional techniques and languages: the binary character of drawing; the discrete nature of mosaic; interfaces as a part of the Western perspectival culture and 'brainframe'; the nature of light and colour, but also art-historical taxonomies, can be studied through new lenses, all thanks to the knowledge generated by the evolution in current technologies (and an awareness of their limits as well).[6] Considering developments at present, one can say that in the digital world, too, 'the whole is more than the sum of its parts:' the huge amount of information at our disposal and the

---

[3] http://www.minervaeurope.org/whatis.htm, (accessed 22 May 2010).

[4] http://www.europeana.eu, launched in November 2008 (accessed 22 May 2010).

[5] Roberto A. Busa, 'Foreword: Perspectives on the Digital Humanities', in *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, ed. Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth (Oxford, 2004) xvii.

[6] See Corrado Maltese, 'Linguaggio analogico e linguaggio digitale', in *Il nuovo mondo dell'immagine elettronica*, ed. Guido and Teresa Aristarco (Bari, 1985) 27–36, now in Maltese, *Per una storia dell'immagine: Da Leonardo alla computer art* (Roma, 1989) 78–85; with special regard to interface, see: Steven Johnson, *Interface Culture: How New Technology Transforms the Way We Create and Communicate* (San Francisco, 1997); On *brainframe*: Derrick de Kerckhove, *Brainframes: Technology, Mind and Business* (Utrecht, 1991).

possibility to interact with it makes relevant features emerge that could not have been imagined before, often at the boundary between specialization and large-scale diffusion.

The key words used to identify images in digital archives, for example, can be considered a semantic cloud around the reproductions of artworks stored in great databases. Thus, the verbal description of artworks (*ekphrasis*) meets the necessities of search queries and something new arises, which can be called 'stenographic electronic *ekphrasis*:' an ancient rhetorical device becomes a tool for searching images using a few specific words that synthetically describe iconography, style and details, suggest associations and resume complex art-historical relations using a language borrowed from the form of the database itself.[7] Users can not only test the effectiveness of these descriptions but, with their feedback, they can also enrich connections while building a useful net of words, images, and links from the perspective of folksonomies (collaboratively produced taxonomies) and social tagging.

In spite of the divisions between more and less enterprising and wealthy institutions and countries, and of the difficulties in reaching a united level of development and exchange, digital tools and environments have been proving their capabilities in meeting at least one of the deepest ambitions of art history: to connect artworks to a net of different and evolving interwoven relations which are now accessible to larger and larger groups of competent users.

The Year 2000

During the Thirtieth International Congress of the History of Art, organized in collaboration with important specialized organizations, such as AHWA-AWHA (Art History Webmasters ASSOCIATION des webmestres en histoire de l'art), RIHA (International Association of Research Institutes in the History of Art), and CHArt (Computers and the History of Art Group), one section was devoted to *Digital Art History Time*.[8] The detailed

---

[7] A Carracci painting representing Mary Magdalen can be accessed in the Bridgeman Art Library archive, using the following key words: saint; breasts; penitent; skull; book; crying; tears; penance; repentant ; humility; humble; Mary; Magdalen.

[8] London, September 3–8, 2000; available online at http://www.unites.uqam.ca/AHWA/ Meetings/2000.CIHA/. CHArt, a 'society open to all who have an interest in the application of computers to the study of art and design', holds an annual conference and publishes the conference proceedings, see the CHArt Yearbook 2005, *Digital Art History: A Subject in*

description of the section clearly pointed out the most relevant fields in research and applications, and it is still a useful basis for an outline of this evolving field: 'Digital imaging and art-historical analysis; Networking and databases; Digital media and teaching; Museums and exhibitions; Digital images and global copyright problems.' Keeping that description as a frame, this chapter will try to illustrate how some of those entries can be relevant for the discipline.[9] It is of course important to recognize that applications and studies on these topics are growing day by day and some of them often overlap: digital imaging converges with virtual restoration and exhibition; digital archiving with educational systems, while copyright aspects affect many of these items, quickly modifying themselves according to legal and social developments. In every country there has been a deep engagement with the issue of copyright permission protocols on digital images, an issue that is related to global file-sharing, creative commons licences, even hacking. The French online publication *Images re-vues*, has undertaken an extended reflection on art history, image policy and publishing in the digital era, including a useful survey by André Gunthert, 'Le droit aux images à l'ère de la publication électronique', and a 'Charte: droit de l'image, droit à l'image', which aims to extend to images the right of scientific quotation and to introduce uniform laws concerning the reproduction and online diffusion of art images.[10]

Digital Imaging and Art-Historical Analysis

Digital image acquisition and processing in the last decade have become both more accessible and more professional. Following a trend that first emerged in medical image analysis, the traditional two-dimensional

---

Transition: Exploring Practice in a Network Society (available online at: http://www.chart .ac.uk/, accessed July 1, 2010).

[9] In 2000, the collection *A Companion to Digital Humanities* offered an updated survey of the topic. Michael Greenhalgh's essay 'Art History' illustrated the impact of the evolution of the computer on the discipline, presenting the most significant perspectives and best practices, the diffusion of software and technical devices, the web resources and the outstanding worldwide academic initiatives and consortia. See Michael Greenhalgh, 'Art History', in Schreibman, ed., *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, 31–45. Also available online at: http://www.digitalhumanities.org/companion (accessed 22 May 2010).

[10] *Images re-vues. Histoire, anthropolgie et théorie de l'art* (http://imagesrevues.org/, accessed 22 May 2010). A comparative analysis of worldwide legal approaches to electronic copyright, 'Indagine conoscitiva. Il diritto d'autore sulle reti di comunicazione elettronica', was published in 2010 by the Italian Communication Authority AGCOM (http://www .agcom.it/, accessed 22 May 2010).

picture, a snapshot of the surface of things, has been replaced by digital representations, made up from discrete elements and layers that can be analysed independently of the whole, manipulated in real time, linked to hypertextual documents, transformed into three-dimensional objects, and diffused, according to their compression, through the Internet.

This evolution is modifying the archives of cultural institutions all over the world, the forms of publishing, teaching, learning, and the habits of acquiring and comparing images to such a degree that one could claim that, thanks to new technologies, everybody is not only a publisher, but also an iconographic researcher and a curator of numberless museums 'without walls'. It has also provoked new problems with regard to the compatibility of standards and the possible alteration of originals. And it has refuelled post-Benjaminian debates about the nature of artworks (and of their *aura*) 'in the age of their digital reproducibility', discovering new features of the *aura* itself, in the very characteristics of digital languages and of networking.[11] Accomplishing at least one of the intimate potentialities of digitization, great efforts (both technological and financial) have been devoted to realizing the most accurate reproductions of non-transportable, destroyed or inaccessible artworks.

In recent years a number of virtual travelling exhibitions have shown very accurate full-size reproductions of works by great masters, collected together in single real locations. An example of the trend of using digital images of masterpieces *in absentia* is the full-size facsimile of Veronese's *The Wedding at Cana*, whose original was once in the Palladian Refectory on San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice. Removed by Napoleon and now in the Louvre Museum, the real painting has been scanned and processed in order to obtain as faithful an image as possibile in terms of resolution, colour, shape and visual information. Realized by the Fondazione Cini and the enterprise Factum Arte, directed by the English artist Adam Lowe, the project is intended to assert the value of reproductions—the fruit of detailed rigorous study—as substitutes for absent originals.[12] Though very impressive and allowing extreme close-up vision, these enterprises mainly

---

[11] See Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht and Michael Marrinan, eds., *Mapping Benjamin: The Work of Art in the Digital Age* (Stanford, 2003); Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version', in Benjamin, *Selected Writings 3 (1935–1938)*, ed. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings (Cambridge, MA, 2002) 101–34.

[12] *Il Miracolo di Cana: L'originalità della ri-produzione*, http://www.cini.it/it/event/detail/1/12 (accessed 22 May 2010).

concentrate on the visual characteristics of artworks, capturing all their features and offering them to the mere visual perception of the public.

Other research directions consider digital facsimiles as artefacts that exploit the multimedia and interactive potentialities of new digital media; their aim is not to provide a substitute for originals in terms of a visual illusion, but to offer a different object which is made of data and information that users can share and manipulate. In this perspective, digital reproductions are structured not only as printable images but above all as explorable interfaces, accessible by different platforms, including multidisciplinary documentation and multiple semantic interpretation. In these terms, the digitized version of an artwork is not intended to compete with the original in terms of visualization, but offers itself as a distinct representation enhanced by data and interactivity.[13] One example coming from a cross-boundary experience is the digital reproduction of the 1550 Map of Mexico City, the original of which is in Uppsala and whose exact facsimile, realized by a research group in Helsinki, has been enhanced with large quantities of historical, artistic and anthropological information, which can be explored employing a touchscreen.[14]

Digital imaging is necessarily a form of art-historical analysis in the case of virtual restoration. One example of best practice is the computer-aided reconstruction of parts of Mantegna's frescoes in the Ovetari Chapel in Padua, severely damaged during the Second World War. The virtual reconstruction, thanks to a computer programme, repositions the fragments on a map created from photographs of the frescos before the bombing. The so called *Progetto Mantegna* also offers accurate online documentation of the history, the methodology, the structure and the placing of the fresco fragments.[15]

Virtual reconstruction, mainly in architecture and archaeology, can make use of immersive virtual reality tools, from the Cave automatic virtual environment, giving users the illusion of exploring a three-dimensional space completely enveloping them, to the spatial three-dimensional reconstruction of single places. 3D virtual reality reconstruction can

---

[13] Antonella Sbrilli, *Storia dell'arte in codice binario: La riproduzione digitale delle opere artistiche* (Milano, 2001).

[14] Lily Díaz-Kommonen, 'Designing and Producing Digital Cultural Heritage: The Map of Mexico 1550', in *La Rivista di Engramma on line*, 54 (2007) (available online at: http://www.engramma.it/engramma_revolution/54/054_internetumanesimo_messico.html, accessed 14 September 2010). See, by the same author, and dealing with some methodological aspects, *Art, Fact and Artifact Production: Design Research and Multidisciplinary Collaboration* (Helsinki, 2002).

[15] See the project website, www.progettomantegna.it/ (accessed 22 May 2010).

thus be considered a sort of 'virtual ecosystem', as in the case of Giotto's Scrovegni Chapel in Padua. In order to solve the problems of accessibility to the monument (restricted due to problems of preservation,) a hyper-media environment has been realized where visitors can navigate a 3D virtual reality reconstruction with architectural, painting and contextual information.[16]

Digital media have also proven themselves useful in the documentation of artworks realized in non-traditional techniques, such as installations, ready-mades, and interactive devices, that can be better represented by means of digital, multimedia and interactive media than by mere photographs or videos, due to the possibilities of providing multidimensional points of view and the active role of spectators in time. Furthermore, the many international exhibitions of contemporary art can be documented and preserved by means of integrated digital and web resources (see the *Artefacta* Project aimed at documenting the many world Art Biennials, starting from the Biennale of Venice 2007).[17] This is quite apart from contemporary artworks that have emerged out of the convergence of electronic and digital media, and are the source of so-called 'new images'. These, intended as the expansions of the dimension of the visible, including sound, tactile, even thermic elements, are made by numeric code, can be generated by two- and three-dimensional computer graphics and by mixing video shooting and enhanced reality. 'New images' can be perceived on different supports and transform themselves in real time. Finally, they can be located in such a 'non-place' as the web itself, and grow thanks to the contributions of communities of users. This convergence of technological research, artistic creativeness and cultural heritage has been explored since 1979 by the Ars Electronica Centre in Linz; its annual festival, Ars Electronica, analyses these developments and their impact on contemporary society and culture.[18]

Some highly specialized research has been devoted to the problem of automatic image recognition. To recognize an image without verbal descriptions or tags, but by means of its visual features, would be of great practical importance for searching inside huge art databases. But the challenge of automatic recognition would also have an application in expert activities, such as so-called computer-aided attributionism or

---

[16] See the website of the Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, http://www.cnr.it/sitocnr/home.html (accessed 22 May 2010).

[17] http://www.treccanilab.com/biennale_di_venezia/ (accessed 22 May 2010).

[18] http://www.aec.at/index_en.php (accessed 22 May 2010).

digital connoisseurship. Image processing for the purposes of the identification of artists, though far from being solved, is being studied by teams of mathematicians and art experts with the aim of capturing the stylistic signature of an artist, analysing patterns and computable characteristics of the brush strokes, the drawing lines, or colour palette.[19] As far as the crucial problem of reproduction is concerned, there is a reciprocal relation between such research and the discipline of art history, given that the history of artworks in reproduction itself constitutes a chapter within the history of art.

New media have also highlighted the problem of the nature of the image; forerunners of electronic and digital images have been recognized in the movements of twentieth-century avant-garde art. The investigations by exponents of Pointillism, Cubism, Futurism, Abstract Art or Surrealism into light, sound, movement, *durée, assemblage*, etc. have all been analysed in the light of subsequent developments in technological images.[20] The interactive installation *Khronos Projector*, by the scientist and artist Alvaro Cassinelli may serve as an illustration of the latter. Defined by the author as 'a video time-warping machine with a tangible deformable screen', the *Khronos Projector* allows users to explore a mass of pre-recorded movies, touching a canvas screen.[21] When exploring faces, for instance, they assume, without solution of continuity, a number of poses that can be compared with Cubist portraits, or with Francis Bacon's distorted faces, or with Duchamp's *Nude Descending a Staircase* or with *Unique Forms of Continuity in Space* (1913) by the Italian Futurist Umberto Boccioni, thus carrying out the intuitions of avant-garde artists and theorists on a brand-new support and with a new syntax. Contemporary artists, too, working with computers, have often provided art historians with new perspectives, short-circuiting tradition and new languages, as in the case of the multimedia manipulation of Leonardo's *Last Supper*, realized in 2008 by the filmmaker Peter Greenaway, which would have been impossible without contemporary cutting-edge digital technologies.[22] As

---

[19] For example, see: http://digitalpaintinganalysis.org/workshop/index.htm, focused on Van Gogh paintings (accessed 22 May 2010).
[20] Mario Costa, *L'estetica dei media: Avanguardie e tecnologia* (Rome, 1999); Michael Rush, *New Media in Late 20th-Century Art* (New York, 1999); Silvia Bordini, *Arte elettronica* (Florence, 2004).
[21] Presented at the Ars Electronica Festival 2006; technical and theoretical information, and videos of the interaction examples can be found at the web site: http://www.k2.t .u-tokyo.ac.jp/members/alvaro/Khronos/ (accessed 22 May 2010).
[22] Peter Greenaway, http://www.petergreenaway.info/ (accessed 22 May 2010).

early as 1999, however, the designer Yugo Nakamura, an expert in digital and networked environments, invented innovative interactive interface systems that were both contemporary artworks and a 'remediation' of artistic heritage.[23] For example, his astonishing *Nervous Matrix on Mona Lisa* allows remote users to manipulate the proportions of Leonardo's icon by typing on their computer's keyboard.[24]

Networking and Databases

Following Erwin Panofsky's analysis of perspective as a symbolic form of western culture, Russian-American computer researcher Lev Manovich has proposed a definition of the database as 'a new symbolic form of a computer age' that provides 'a new way to structure our experience of ourselves and of the world'.[25] This statement is indeed justified and confirmed by the rapid development in recent years of database forms, together with the elaboration of information-retrieval systems, refined search engines, metadata standards, controlled vocabulary tools and user-friendly interfaces.[26]

In addition to the national OPAC (On-line Public Access Catalogue) and MetaOPAC, that are the backbones of research in library catalogues, following paths opened up in the pre-computer era by the Iconclass classification system (now integrated into many museum and archive databases), and by the Getty Institute Research Program (pioneer in the elaboration of art-historical thesauri), many authoritative databases have been created and implemented, offering not only catalogue information, but also complete downloadable texts and scalable images.[27] Growing on the basis of the digitization of existing document collections in libraries or museums, or assembling scattered ones for monographic or relational purposes, many specialist databases, managed by networks of academic partners, offer integrated access to online art history resources and allow accurate end-user searches.

---

[23] See http://www.yugop.com. On the concept of remediation in new media culture, see Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge, MA, 1999).

[24] *The Nervous Matrix on Mona Lisa* is accessible at http://yugop.com/ver2/works/typospace3.html (accessed 22 May 2010).

[25] Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, MA, 2001).

[26] Murtha Baca and William Tronzo, 'Art History and the Digital World', *Art Journal* 65.4 (2006) 51–5.

[27] Iconclass is available online at, http://www.iconclass.nl (accessed 22 May 2010).

Antique and Renaissance sources, *corpora* of rare artworks and documents, private photographic archives: it would be impossible to list all the collections at our disposal. Some of the most relevant and representative of these categories are *The Census of Antique Works of Art Known to the Renaissance*, supported by a number of partners including the Getty, the Warburg Institute, the Hertziana Library in Rome and the Humboldt University in Berlin;[28] Pisa Scuola Normale Superiore's *Bivio* and *Monumenta Rariora*;[29] the Marburg Photoarchive (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Philipps-Universität);[30] the Warburg Institute collections on the survival of the Classics;[31] the French database *Joconde* allowing research into national holdings;[32] and the Federico Zeri Foundation in Bologna, which has digitized the art and photographic library of the famous Italian scholar (1921–1998), who himself was a sort of living image database.[33]

The National Library websites of most countries, as well as those of many Ministries of Culture and/or Education, and of many university art history departments, usually offer updated lists of links to digital resources by area, discipline, subject. A good starting point for art-historical research is still the *Artcyclopedia*, an index of art images classified by artist, museum and subject.[34] Other data collections can be consulted subject to registration (and at often high cost) such as the ARTstor Digital Library, initiated by The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, its name derived from JSTOR, the digital archive of hundreds of academic journals, many of them on art history and cognate disciplines.[35] The latter kinds of resource raise complex issues of ownership, although the results are not always to the disadvantage of users. An interesting example of mediation between the interests of copyright owners and the end-users is offered by the private Bridgeman image archive.[36] The Bridgeman Art Library is also the coordinating partner of the European Community funded Project MILE (Metadata Image Library Exploitation) to improve accessibility and trade of digital images throughout Europe.

---

[28] http://www.census.de (accessed 22 May 2010).
[29] http://bivio.signum.sns.it/; http://mora.sns.it (accessed 15 September 2010).
[30] http://www.fotomarburg.de (accessed 22 May 2010).
[31] http://warburg.sas.ac.uk/ (accessed 22 May 2010).
[32] http://www.culture.gouv.fr/documentation/joconde/fr/pres.htm (accessed 22 May 2010).
[33] http://www.fondazionezeri.unibo.it (accessed 22 May 2010).
[34] http://www.artcyclopedia.com (accessed 22 May 2010).
[35] http://www.artstor.org (accessed 22 May 2010).
[36] http://www.bridgeman.co.uk (accessed 22 May 2010).

One notable current trend in this field is the mutual linking and the creation of meta-databases, as in the case of the German *Prometheus*, an online meta-database of existing picture collections on the Internet.[37] As this is happening in other branches of computing and the humanities, the reciprocal connections and the mutual implementation of resources are very significant in the perspective of building digital data repositories as reliable knowledge hubs.

Digital Media and Teaching

In the relatively short history of the convergence between new media and art history, one of the most relevant formats has been the CD-ROM. In the mid-1990s many excellent art-historical CD-ROMs were published by French electronic publishers in collaboration with the Réunion des Musées Nationaux. Since the appearance of works such as *Le Louvre* (1994) or *Moi, Cézanne* (1995), digital media have proved more than able to compete with traditional forms of art-historical publishing, especially with regard to the possibility of new features.[38] Zoomable images and hypertextual choices were offered at a high scholarly level together with narrative innovations. The concept of 'edutainment' (education + entertainment) emerged in this context—although not always used in a positive sense—by the experience of transferring art history to interactive formats, inventing new forms of exercises, challenge, feedback and verification devices.[39] The era of the CD-ROM did not last long, for it was soon overtaken by the web, but the novelties introduced by those products, can still be found on many sites, DVDs, totem and interactive museum guides. Moreover, many art-historical publications in hard copy have adopted some of its formats (with the inclusion of text boxes, annotated images, or internal links) and it has had a major impact on the way the history of art has come to be presented and taught, in the classroom, on screen or on paper.

At the boundary of new media, networking, databases and electronic learning, relevant and valuable experience can be gained from a project such as *Victorianweb* by George Landow, a pioneer in the application of computing to literature and the history of art, and the author of

---

[37] http://www.prometheus-bildarchiv.de (accessed 22 May 2010).

[38] *Le Louvre*, CD-ROM, Montparnasse Multimedia, Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1994; *Moi, Cézanne*, CD-ROM, Index+, Réunion des Musés Nationaux, 1995.

[39] Valerio Eletti, *Manuale di editoria multimediale* (Rome and Bari, 2003).

the fundamental work *Hypertext* (1992), (followed, in 1997 and 2006, by *Hypertext 2.0* and *Hypertext 3.0*).[40] *Victorianweb* is a notable collection of resources devoted to Victorian culture and society, with both a clear and rich hypertextual structure, continuously enriched thanks to contributions from scholars and students worldwide. In this context one might also mention *The Rossetti Archive* project focused on one artist—Dante Gabriel Rossetti—who left a corpus both of texts and paintings with multifaceted internal links.[41] In addition, *The Rossetti Archive* participates in the development of NINES (Networked Infrastructure for Nineteenth-Century Electronic Scholarship), an aggregation of peer-reviewed scholarly studies, based on open source software, under a Creative Commons License. At present many art-historical journals follow the scientific model of peer-reviewing electronic publications, exploiting the potentialities of the collaborative approach of digital media.[42]

In 2004, the web search engine company Google launched Google Print, now Google Books, a tool that searches the full texts of thousands of scanned books, and Google Scholar, which provides a repository of scholarly information. It is worth noting that the rich world of newsletters and forums, besides wikisystems, provide important ongoing experiences in the perspective of a dynamic publishing and learning digital environment.[43] As far as teaching and learning are concerned, at present, many art databases offer substantial learning resources, thematic timelines, and expert guidance. The purpose is to support e-learning with proper means and resources; this involves not only transferring traditional slides into digital images, but also building effective learning-objects, scalable and collectable according to specific technological platforms, international metadata standards and different user categories. In this context a note is in order regarding the fact that some important museums have implemented learn-on line services, based on interaction with the users.[44]

---

[40] *Victorian Web* is available at: http://www.victorianweb.org (accessed 22 May 2010). See George P. Landow, *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology* (Baltimore, MD, 1992).

[41] http://www.rossettiarchive.org (accessed 22 May 2010).

[42] Hilary Ballon and Mariët Westermann, *Art History and its Publications in the Electronic Age: Report on a Study Funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation* (2006), http://cnx.org/content/col10376/latest/ (accessed 22 May 2010).

[43] See for example, http://wikiartpedia.org (accessed 22 May 2010).

[44] See Tate's website: http://www.tate.org.uk/learnonline/ (accessed 19 April 2011).

Museums and Exhibitions

The impact of digital technologies on museums and exhibitions is increasingly important and varied. It includes: single museum websites; museum portals and networks; two- and three-dimensional reconstructions of existing museums and collections both offline and on the web; two- and three-dimension reconstructions of immaterial, scattered, and non-existent collections; *in situ* digital interactive devices to explore museum holdings; museum guides available on palm, e-book, mobile phone, and radiofrequency devices, with special attention to the disabled.

The approach here is no different from that of digital artwork reproductions or publications. One can observe a linear transfer of information from real-world to computer-based environments (visible in the many websites of museums offering remote information) or a deep transformation of digital objects according to the features and potentialities of the new media (evident in the less frequent, but much more satisfying websites of museums offering a complex approach to their holdings, with multiple services and an information net).

After the first experiments and early approaches, in the 1990s the relationship between computing and museums matured and consolidated. The International Council of Museums (ICOM) began organizing directories of online museums and published the Virtual Library Museum Pages in order to monitor and collect the very different experiments under way.[45] The term 'virtual museum', a corollary of the pervading concept of the 'virtual', became widespread in art-historical discussions and conferences, and was accompanied by the announcement of numerous international competitions for the realization of virtual museums.[46]

In 1991, the media artist Jeffrey Shaw interpreted the virtual museum as an artwork, realizing a tautological computer graphic installation where the explorer navigates in a virtual space that has the same appearance as the real one.[47] Since then the range of interpretations and proposals has

---

[45] http://icom.museum (accessed 22 May 2010).

[46] On the virtual museum see Bernard Deloche, *Le musée virtuel: Vers une éthique des nouvelles images* (Paris, 2001). On the question of the virtual see Pierre Lévy, *Qu'est-ce que le virtuel?* (Paris, 1995); *Archimuse* (Archives & Museum Informatics, http://www.archimuse.com, accessed 15 September 2010) is a rich resource for all aspects of museum informatics, as is the International Cultural Heritage Information Meetings/International Conference on Hypermedia and Interactivity in Museums (ICHIM), founded in 1991.

[47] www.jeffrey-shaw.net/ (accessed 22 May 2010).

proven to be extremely wide, involving the most recent computer applications, such as tagged artworks emitting information captured by museum visitors. New possibilities abound; as Paolo Galluzzi, director of the Museo Galileo in Florence, has pointed out, 'In the digital domain there are no buildings or walls, and we are not obliged to reproduce distinctions based on the typologies of material objects or on the various nature of their physical shells.'[48] Digital museums must not be understood as clones of real ones, but as the protagonists of a new form of shared knowledge, as meta-repositories of cultural heritage used by a web community formed by subjects who, thanks to the development of new technologies such as the semantic web, can be at the same time both users and providers, clients and servers. The recent Google Art Project allows access to high definition artwork reproductions and exploration of the museums where they are located.[49]

Conclusion

Art history is necessarily affected by such changing perspectives and trends, even if it is too early to define with confidence the nature and the directions of these changes. Among the main innovations are the extremely easy and quick supply of images and information, the potency of the search engines, new ways of co-operation between art historians, computer experts and web designers, and scholars' connected networks. A *brainframe* affected by digital items can be recognized in the diffusion of conceptual maps and relational databases, albums and inventories, as products of specific research projects which would be impossible to transfer completely to paper. The sensibility toward fluid, immaterial, changeable and recombinable versions of art-historical studies renders digital media particularly useful for building both individual and collective palimpsests.

In this regard it is of no small significance that engagement with digital media has led to a reconsideration of some aspects of the research of the German scholar Aby Warburg (1866–1929), with regard to concepts such as association, hyperlink, rhizomatic structure, and nonlinear recombination of elements. At the 30th International Congress of the History of Art

---

[48] www.imss.fi.it/mesmuses/galluzzi.html (accessed 22 May 2010).
[49] http://www.googleartproject.com/ (accessed 10 February 2011).

(2000) the name of Aby Warburg recurred in discussions concerning the impact of the web on iconographic classification.[50]

Both his writings, full of flow-chart-like textual synopses, and his efforts to find original ways of communicating the multidisciplinary core of his studies, not least his *Mnemosyne Atlas*, have suggested analogies with these concepts. António Guerreiro extravagantly claimed that the Hamburg scholar 'can be considered a forerunner of the hypertext' and, as Michaela Glashoff and others have evocatively stated, his work provides for an art history situated 'between the Talmud and the Internet'.[51] The richness of Warburg's heritage offered material for Marion Müller's PIAV (Politisch-Ikonographisches Archiv der Vision/Visual Archive of Political Iconography), a visual database of political images, intended as a visual library for thematic search and analysis.[52]

Following Warburg's lead, groups of researchers have been working on electronic versions of his *Mnemosyne Atlas* and on designing platforms for interdisciplinary research inspired by his complex experiments with words and images.[53] Even the particular form of cataloguing taken by his research library in Hamburg (now the Warburg Institute in London), keeping to the rule of 'good neighbourliness' amongst books, has been seen as a forerunner of present efforts at creating information storage and retrieval systems based on semantic association, rather than on indexing. Users can not only find the books they are looking for but also, more significantly, the documents they need for their research, according to associations rooted in the interconnected levels of human culture, which emerge by dint of the properties of the system itself. This also raises the

---

[50] Ross Woodrow, 'Iconography and the Internet: Warburg's fantasy becomes reality' (paper presented at the Thirtieth International Congress of the History of Art, London, September 3–8, 2000).

[51] António Guerreiro, 'Enciclopédia e Hipertexto: A Biblioteca Warburg. Entre o Labirinto e o Hipertexto', http://www.educ.fc.ul.pt/hyper/warb-labirinto.htm (accessed 22 May 2010). The phrase was coined by Michaela Glashoff, Andrea Neumann and Martin Deppner in *Aby M. Warburgs Bilderatlas zwischen Talmud und Netzwerk*, the title of the 1987 INSEA Congress, Hamburg, quoted by Georges Didi-Huberman, *L'image survivante: Histoire de l'art et temps de fantômes selon Aby Warburg* (Paris, 2002) 483. Warburg's atlas, which remained incomplete at his death, has subsequently been published: Martin Warnke and Claudia Brink, eds., *Der Bilderatlas Mnemosyne* (Berlin, 1999, 2nd revised edn. 2003).

[52] Jacobs University, Bremen

[53] See *La Rivista di Engramma on line* (www.engramma.it, abstracts in English and Latin), WEL 'The Warburg Electronic Library', http://www.welib.de/e-entry.htm, and the Warburg Haus Hamburg (http://www.warburg-haus.de, accessed 22 May 2010).

question of the role of serendipity. Helped on by present research tools, the latter should not be undervalued; unexpected information, emerging as an *objet trouvé* from the complexity and the fullness of the system, can be considered a central feature of contemporary, networked, art history.

TECHNICAL ART HISTORY:
THE SYNERGY OF ART, CONSERVATION AND SCIENCE

Erma Hermens

Introduction

Researching the material history of an artefact is the objective of what is presently called technical art history, a relatively young field of research involving art historians, conservators and scientists but also reaching out to other disciplines such as economic and social history, anthropology and aesthetics. The interdisciplinary character of technical art history combines a variety of expertise into a holistic research approach that concerns the creative process from idea to artwork, at any one time and place, and from any culture.

In the conservation field, the introduction of scientific research on artworks in the 1930s initiated the development of new analytical methodologies, which especially in the last decades has resulted in highly sophisticated applications that have provided revealing insights into the material composition of artworks and their deterioration processes, and have led to new approaches in conservation treatments. The new data thus gained are imperative for understanding the present condition of the artwork including the traces of the history of the object through ageing, through changes inherent to the materials and techniques used, and through conservation treatments or other external impact. The original voice of the artist found in diaries, correspondence, treatises, and other contemporary writings on techniques is crucial for an insightful interpretation of these experimental data.

Is technical art history therefore a quest for the authentic artwork? Or does it examine plural authenticities, namely 'the state of the object in which it exists' at various moments in the artwork's history, accepting contextual impact as part of the objects 'life' and thus of its authenticity?[1] Is it a method for understanding these authenticities through the examination

---

[1] Salvador Muñoz-Viñas, 'Beyond authenticity', in *Art Conservation and Authenticities: Material, Concept, Context*, ed. Erma Hermens and Tina Fiske (London, 2009) 33–9 (here 36).

of the creative process from idea to artwork, using a holistic approach when addressing the material object that includes internal and external evidence obtained by interdisciplinary research?

This chapter discusses the development of technical art history, which goes hand in hand with an increasingly scientific approach in conservation research and methodology, rapidly developing scientific analytical applications, and a growing interest in documentary sources on techniques and materials past and present.

Dark Pictures

A ubiquitous but very apt illustration of the eighteenth-century debate that marked the beginning of discussion of the effects of time on paintings is represented by William Hogarth's print *Time Smoking a Picture* from his *Analysis of Beauty*, published in 1753. Hogarth ridicules and attacks connoisseurs and art dealers who support a trade in old masters of dubious quality and encourage a taste for 'dark pictures', thus disadvantaging contemporary British artists through a misplaced emphasis on the past. A continuing veneration of classical sources, rooted in a rule of thumb naturalism that ignored what was happening elsewhere in Europe, came at the expense of the development of a modern British art. Hogarth's critique also addresses the debate on aesthetics in which either the harmonizing or mellowing effect of ageing—darkening of oils, yellowing of varnish—that characterizes the old masters are praised, or the distortion of the artist's original intent is deliberated on. Hogarth takes a stand against this so-called beneficial effect of time and the aesthetic theories based on it, opposing what is so adequately explained by the essayist and critic Joseph Addison's text 'A Dream of Painters'.[2] Addison describes how he dreams of a gallery with new and old pictures where, on the side of the old masters, an old man is retouching many 'fine pieces', with a pencil that worked 'imperceptibly'. However, after incessant and repeated 'touch after touch' it seemed that 'he wore off insensibly every little disagreeable Gloss that hung upon a Figure. He also added such a beautiful brown to the shades, and Mellowness to the colours, that he made every picture appear more

---

[2] Joseph Addison, 'A Dream of Painters' (1711) in Addison, *Essays by Joseph Addison* I, ed., Sir James Frazer (London, 1915) 291–5. For a comprehensive discussion of patina see Randolph Starn, 'Three Ages of "Patina" in Painting', *Representations* 78 (2002) 86–115.

perfect than when it came fresh from the Master's Pencil'. Addison identifies the old man as Time.

Hogarth responded in print, portraying Chronos (Time) seated in front of an easel and holding a scythe which cuts through the canvas, while blowing black smoke onto the picture with next to him a big pot of varnish. Both time and varnish are clearly held responsible for the almost unrecognizably obscured landscape on the easel. Chronos sits on a broken antique sculpture, indicating a misplaced reverence for the 'old'. Hogarth added the rather ironic inscription: 'as statues moulder into worth', satirizing contemporary connoisseurs' taste for 'dark' pictures, and in his *Analysis of Beauty* he sneers at the toning down of colours and harmonies with tinted varnishes, calling it absurd and stating that 'colours cannot be too brilliant if properly disposed'.[3] He relates how the passage of time 'untunes' a painting, not just by an increasingly yellow varnish so appreciated by the art establishment, but more so by irreversible changes that take place through the characteristic ageing of the materials used:

> for as they are made some of metal, some of earth, some of stone, and others of more perishable materials, time cannot operate on them otherwise than as by daily experience we find it doth, which is, that one changes darker, another lighter, one quite a different colour, whilst another, as ultramarine, will keep its natural brightness.... Therefore how is it possible that such different materials, ever variously changing should coincidentally coincide with the artist's intentions?[4]

Hogarth emphasizes the inherent instability of painting materials and thus 'the impossibility of genuine restoration'.[5]

The growing interest in the original appearance of artworks and the fascination with the mysteries around the technical ingenuity of artists such as Titian and other High Renaissance masters, led the American painter Benjamin West, then president of the Royal Academy, and various other Royal Academicians, to be persuaded by a Thomas Provis and his daughter Ann Jemima, of the existence of an 'authentic' old manuscript that would unveil the 'Venetian Secret'. The text survives in Joseph Farington's diaries and presents as key elements the use of linseed oil,

---

[3] William Hogarth, *The Analysis of Beauty* (1753), ed. Joseph Burke (Oxford, 1955) 132–3.

[4] Hogarth, *The Analysis of Beauty*, 130.

[5] See for a historic discussion of toned varnishes: Ernst Gombrich, 'Dark Varnishes: Variations on a Theme by Pliny', *Burlington Magazine* 104.707 (1962) 51–5, reprinted in David Bomford and Mark Leonard, eds., *Issues in the Conservation of Paintings* (Los Angeles, 2005) 505–18.

dark absorbent grounds, and what was called 'Titian Shade'—a mixture of red lake, indigo, ivory black and Prussian blue. The latter was an early eighteenth-century invention, and therefore its inclusion should have made anyone suspicious.[6] Yet, the Provises collected a handsome sum for a copyright agreement made with Farington's help. It took two years for the hoax to be exposed, during which many Royal Academy members 'tried' the recipes they had purchased from the Provises.[7] To the embarrassment of West and his colleagues, they were hugely ridiculed in the press and in artistic circles. Yet, the whole unfortunate episode laid the foundation for further research into artists' materials and techniques, as well as for an assessment of the restorer's role as already addressed by Hogarth and his contemporaries.

The worsening condition of paintings by Reynolds and Turner, amongst others, advanced an interest in the chemistry of painting materials. In 1871 a professorship in Chemistry was established at the Royal Academy and experiments by colourmen such as George Field, led to a greater understanding of the behaviour of materials; knowledge that had been largely lost in eighteenth-century academic teaching.[8]

In this context historic examples of the public perception of aged artworks, leading to so-called cleaning controversies in the nineteenth century are very telling indeed. The controversies took place in a period where conservation was performed by artist-restorers and no clear definition of the restoration profession existed. Taste for the golden glow of the old masters overruled concern for the artist's original intent, and the removal of darkened varnish layers from the old masters in the National Gallery in 1847 sparked a fierce public debate on aesthetics and restoration. In this context the art critic John Ruskin, in a rant against public galleries and 'foolish or careless curators', named museums 'places of execution', stating that 'over their doors you only want the Dantesque inscription, *Lasciate ogni speranza, voi che entrate*'.[9] Significantly, this public debate led to an evaluation of restoration methods, the profession of the restorer,

---

[6] Kathryn Cave, ed., *The Diary of Joseph Farington*, 16 vols. (London and New Haven, CT, 1978–84), 18 January 1797.

[7] See also for a detailed description John Gage, *Colour and Meaning: Art, Science and Symbolism* (London, 2000) 153–61.

[8] Gage, *Colour and Meaning*, 153.

[9] John Ruskin, 'The Accumulation and Distribution of Art', II, (Manchester, 1867), in Ruskin, *A Joy Forever* (London, 1904) 101.

and to a growing interest in scientific research into painting materials and techniques.[10]

Interdisciplinary Research

At a round table meeting with conservators, curators and scientists at the Getty Conservation Institute held in 2004 David Bomford described the role of the modern conservator as follows:

> By examining paintings and interpreting physical evidence, we are able to suggest narratives on the making of works of art by virtue of the understanding of materials and structures that our practical experience gives us. The narrative continues with cumulative events in the subsequent history of the work—ageing, deterioration, accident, repair, intervention, adaptation, reinterpretation—positive and negative events, as the restorer, art historian and critic Cesare Brandi classified them, some valued, some regretted.

Bomford went on to emphasize the decision-making process that takes place on the questions which elements of the history of the work are to be preserved and which concealed, stating that 'the conservator as narrator inevitably both interprets and intervenes in the narrative'.[11]

Conservation as an act of critical interpretation is today supported by technical art history, which Maryan Ainsworth describes as 'an enhanced and more scientific connoisseurship—(that) provides the foundation for our appreciation and understanding of human artistic endeavour'.[12] The establishment by Edward Forbes of the first conservation research centre in the United States at the Fogg Art Museum at Harvard University, in 1928 (now the Strauss Centre for Conservation and Technical Studies), followed by its publication of *Technical Studies in the Fine Arts*, from 1932 onwards, was pivotal for the development of a science-based conservation practice and new methods of studying techniques and materials. The first X-radiography research was undertaken on a large group of paintings in American museums in the 1940s, led by Alan Burroughs, who in the

---

[10] For an overview of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scientific research see Jilleen Nadolny, 'The First Century of Published Scientific Analyses of the Materials of Historical Painting and Polychromy, circa 1780–1880', *Reviews in Conservation* 4 (2003) 39–51.

[11] David Bomford, 'The Conservator as Narrator: Changing Perspectives in the Conservation of Paintings', in *Personal Viewpoints: Thoughts about Paintings Conservation*, ed. Mark Leonard (Los Angeles, 2004) 12.

[12] Maryan W. Ainsworth, 'From Connoisseurship to Technical History: The Evolution of the Interdisciplinary Study of Art', *Getty Newsletter* 20.1 (2005) 4–10.

1920s pioneered the use of X-radiography on artworks, building on previous experiments in scientific laboratories in Europe.[13] In the late 1960s infrared reflectography was developed by J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer, a physicist at Groningen University in the Netherlands, which made possible the exploration of underdrawings.[14] Dendrochronology, a method for dating wood panels based on year ring patterns, was introduced in the 1980s by Peter Klein, a wood biologist at the University of Hamburg. The microscopic and chemical analyses of paint cross-sections for identifying pigments and layer build-up began in the 1950s with Joyce Plesters, a scientist from the scientific department of the National Gallery London, one of the specialists in this new research method, which was soon taken up by many major museums.[15] These new techniques opened up a wide range of applications for a more scientifically oriented research method in support of conservation, but also of art-historical research, hence the term 'technical art history'.

The importance of understanding the material composition of art was even recognized by the art historian and connoisseur Bernard Berenson, who had emphasized the importance of intuition for traditional connoisseurship (1902): 'when I see a picture, in most cases I recognize it at once as being or not being by the master it is ascribed to; the rest is merely a question of how to try to fish out the evidence that will make the conviction as plain to others as it is to me.' Interestingly, he agreed to write a foreword to Daniel V. Thompson's *The Materials and Techniques of Medieval Painting*, in which he showed a willingness to consider the study of techniques as an 'ancillary aid' to art-historical studies: 'I regard all questions of technique as ancillary to the aesthetic experience. Human energy is limited, or at least mine is; but if I had greatly more, there is nothing about all the ancillary aids to the understanding of the work of art that I should not try to master.'[16] Little did he know that Thompson's work

---

[13] For an overview see Alan Burroughs, *Art Criticism from a Laboratory* (Boston, MA, 1938).

[14] Johann R.J. van Asperen de Boer, 'Infrared Reflectography: a Method for the Examination of Paintings', *Applied Optics* 7 (1968) 1711–14.

[15] See Joyce Plesters, 'The Preparation and Study of Paint Cross-Sections', *The Museums Journal* 54.4 (1954) 97–101; Plesters, 'Cross-Sections and Chemical Analysis of Paint Samples', *Studies in Conservation* 2.3 (1956) 110–57, is still a key text.

[16] Bernard Berenson, *Rudiments of Connoisseurship: Study and Criticism of Italian Art* (New York, 1962, first published 1902); Berenson, Foreword to Daniel V. Thompson, *The Materials and Techniques of Medieval Painting* (London, 1956, first published 1936) 7.

and especially his interdisciplinary approach would develop into, as Ainsworth stated, 'an enhanced and more scientific connoisseurship.'

A good example of a similar process is the Rembrandt Research Project (RRP) which started in 1968 as a project based on traditional connoisseurship, as it was believed that Rembrandt's oeuvre was contaminated with many copies, later imitations and forgeries. Yet, as Ernst van de Wetering states while reflecting on the first three volumes of the Rembrandt Corpus: 'faith in connoisseurship had grown to such an extent that it sometimes overruled evidence of a more objective nature.'[17] The project originally aimed at the establishment of categories of authenticity supporting connoisseurship with data from X-radiography and dendrochronology. Controversies on a number of paintings led the team to re-examine their reasoning behind the categories applied to paintings as being ' "right" or "wrong", or (sporadically) "don't know" '.[18] This strict categorization was re-evaluated as the accumulation of scientific and visual data demonstrated the complexity of stylistic and technical characterizations. Van de Wetering describes how in the new RRP approach, the modern Rembrandt connoisseur should also try to understand the paintings 'as the result of thinking and working processes.' Otherwise he is simply 'another beholder with a little more art-historical baggage, a beholder who has merely assumed the authority of the "connoisseur".'[19]

In the United States, in the early 1980s, John Brealey (1925–2003), Head of the Paintings Conservation department at the Metropolitan Museum in New York and well known for his interest in interdisciplinary studies, organized a series of highly popular seminars for museum curators and directors, in which he taught conservation practice and historical materials and techniques in front of the actual paintings. He advocated a direct engagement with the making of art and its present appearance, opening up a route to improved communication between the various disciplines. In the only text representing his views 'Who Needs a Conservator?', written in 1983, Brealey states: 'Decisions made in the treatment of a work of art are an exercise in connoisseurship. Since one is dealing with

---

[17] Ernst van de Wetering and Paul Broekhof, 'New directions in the Rembrandt Research Project, Part I: the 1642 self-portrait in the Royal Collection', *The Burlington Magazine* 138 (March 1996) 174. The article discusses the controversy surrounding attribution and re-attribution of the *Portrait of Rembrandt in a Flat Cap* (1642) in the Royal Collection.
[18] Van de Wetering and Broekhof, 'New directions', 174.
[19] Van de Wetering, 'Connoisseurship and Rembrandt's Paintings: New Directions in the Rembrandt Research Project II', *The Burlington Magazine* 150 (February 2008) 90.

visual values anything that affects the look of the work of art must affect the meaning. In fact, the look is the meaning.'[20] He clearly refuted the purely clinical and forensic approaches most conservation students were trained in:

> Although the buck will always stop with the conservator because he has the life or death of the painting in his hands, something more must be done to promote closer interdisciplinary collaboration in the future. The moment the art historian, conservator and scientist see the work of art as a mutual focal point, then the sensitivity and sophistication of the approach will be commensurate with the significance of the artist's work for society.[21]

Brealey promoted interdisciplinary research which resulted in amongst others an ambitious examination of all the Rembrandts in the Metropolitan's collection with neutron activation radiography.[22]

This was only the start of many such projects and of the growing inclusion of technical descriptions and discussions of artists' practice in exhibition catalogues from major galleries such as the exemplary *Art in the Making* and *Making and Meaning* series of the National Gallery in London, with its strong focus not only on content but also on form.[23] In 1972, the first issue of the *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* was published in London, presenting articles resulting from collaborations between curatorial, conservation and scientific departments within the National Gallery.[24]

Key, however, to the success of these endeavours is the communication between the various disciplines. As Lesley Carlyle very aptly states: 'For the art historian to ignore the material aspects of paintings is to leave out something of vital importance to the artist. And to be ignorant of changes

---

[20] John Brealey, 'Who Needs a Conservator?', in *Training in Conservation: A Symposium on the Occasion of the Dedication of the Stephen Chan House*, ed. Norbert S. Baer (New York, 1983), reproduced in David Bomford and Mark Leonard, eds., *Issues in the Conservation of Painting* (Los Angeles, 2004) 118.

[21] Brealey, 'Who Needs a Conservator?', 123.

[22] See for example: Maryan W. Ainsworth, John Brealey, Egbert Haverkamp-Begeman, and Pieter Meyers, *Art and Autoradiograph: Insights into the Genesis of Paintings by Rembrandt, Van Dyck and Vermeer* (New York, 1982).

[23] See, for example, David Bomford, Jill Dunkerton, Dillian Gordon, Ashok Roy, and Jo Kirby, *Art in the Making: Italian Painting before 1400* (London, 1989); David Bomford, ed., Rachel Billinge, Lorne Campbell, Jill Dunkerton, Susan Foister, Jo Kirby, Carol Plazzotta, Ashok Roy, and Marika Spring, *Art in the Making: Underdrawings in Renaissance Paintings* (London, 2002); David Bomford, Jo Kirby, Ashok Roy, Axel Rüger, and Raymond White, *Art in the Making: Rembrand* (London, 2nd edn., 2007); Christopher Brown, *Making and Meaning: Rubens' Landscapes* (London, 1998); Susan Foister, Ashok Roy, and Martin Wyld, *Making and Meaning: Holbein's Ambassadors* (London, 1998).

[24] Excerpts of the *Technical Bulletin* will be online from 2010, which will make their exemplary interdisciplinary approach even more accessible.

that are purely physical can lead to quite unnecessary misunderstanding.' However, the conservator should also take the theoretical context into account: 'For neither to benefit from the knowledge of the other is simply to remain stuck in the ruts formed by a centuries old debate.'[25] An increasing dissociation from this old debate is demonstrated, for example, by a series of international conferences addressing artists' practice, such as the symposium held at Leiden in 1995, *Historical Painting Techniques, Materials and Studio Practice*, the Dublin conference of the International Institute for Conservation (IIC) on *Painting Techniques: History, Materials, and Studio Practice* (1998), or the recent conference at the National Gallery London, *Studying Old Master Paintings: Practice and Technology* (2009), which highlight the growing interest in and importance of technical art history.

These developments should be set against the huge progress made by conservation science in the last two decades, refining conservation methods and adding significantly to a 'scientific connoisseurship' striving for a less subjective approach. Technical art history also changed character, with a stronger focus on material culture and the artwork as physical object; it 'developed a new concrete framework to answer art-historical questions'.[26] This requires ample research into primary source material on artistic practice from a wide range of textual and visual sources in the search for the artist's original voice.

The Artist's Voice

The study of both written and visual source material on artists' practices, such as workshop manuals, technical treatises, ledgers, inventories, diaries, depictions of the artist in the studio, artist's self-portraits, film, photography, or artists' interviews contributes significantly to an understanding of the material complexity of artworks, both in terms of their meaning and their production at a certain time and place.

---

[25] Lesley Carlyle, 'Design, Technique and Execution: The Dichotomy between Theory and Craft in Nineteenth Century British Instruction Manuals on Oil Painting', in *Looking through Paintings: The Study of Painting Techniques and Materials in Support of Art Historical Research*, ed. Erma Hermens, Annemiek Ouwerkerk, and Nicola Costaras (London and Baarn, 1998) 26.

[26] Mark Clarke, 'Asymptotically Approaching the Past: Historiography and Critical Use of Sources in Art Technological Source Research', in *Art Technology: Sources and Methods: Proceedings of the Second Symposium of Art Technological Source Research Study Group, Madrid 2007*, eds. Stefanos Kroustallis, Joyce H. Townsend, Elena Cenalmor Bruquetas, Ad Stijnman, and Margarita San Andres Moya (London, 2008) 20.

With its first occurrences well back in the eighteenth century, research into art technological sources has made a strong entry in the art-historical and conservation world over the last decades.[27] An interesting case study can be made of the mystery around Jan van Eyck's invention of oil painting as described by Vasari in his *Lives of the Painters*, which evoked early debate from its publication onwards.[28] For example, in England in the eighteenth century, a more substantiated approach based on experiments and documentary source research pursued a truthful rendering of Vasari's theory. The English antiquarian Horace Walpole (1717–1797) describes in his *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1762) the mentioning of 'painters oil' in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century documents, thus challenging Vasari's account.[29] Gotthold Ephraim Lessing published the treatise *Vom Alter der Oelmalerey aus dem Theophilus Presbyter* (circa 1100), in Germany in 1774, followed by an English edition by Rudolf Erich Raspe in 1781. Raspe also published Heraclius's *De coloribus et artibus romanorum*, dated to between the tenth and thirteenth centuries. Both treatises predate Van Eyck and refer to the use of oil as a medium for painting.[30]

Extensive experiments on the use of oil in English medieval painting followed, as for example performed around 1802 by the medical doctor John Haslam (1764–1844) on samples from murals in the chapel of St Stephen, Westminster, commissioned by the historian and engraver John Thomas Smith (1766–1833). Haslam's positive results were later underpinned by Smith's discovery of documents listing payments for 'painter's oil' which he published in his *Antiquities of Westminster* in 1807, emphasizing the importance of combining experiments and documentary research.[31] Although there was clearly ample proof for the refutation of Van Eyck's crucial role, both from experiments, albeit rudimentary, and from primary documentary sources, the debate continued, with attacks to

---

[27] Jo Kirby, 'Towards a new discipline?', in Kroustallis, Townsend, Bruquetas, Stijnman, and San Andres Moya, eds., *Art Technology*, 7–15.

[28] Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, I, trans. Gaston du C. de Vere, (New York, 1996) 424–9.

[29] Jilleen Nadolny, 'A Problem of Methodology: Merrifield, Eastlake and the Use of Oil-based Media by Medieval English Painters', in *ICOM 14th Triennial Meeting, The Hague: 12–16 September 2005*, ed. Isabelle Verger (London, 2005) 1028.

[30] Rudolf E. Raspe, *A Critical Essay on Oil Painting, proving that the Art of Painting in Oil was known before the pretended Discovery of John and Hubert van Eyck; to which are added, Theophilus De Arte Pingendi* (London, 1781).

[31] Quoted in Nadolny, 'A Problem of Methodology', 1029.

and fro between adversaries, and influenced by a rather selective memory as far as evidence was concerned.[32]

Mrs Mary Philadelphia Merrifield (1804–1889), an amateur art historian and algologist, ignored these experimental results, which basically rejected Vasari's story. In her translation of 1844 of Cennino Cennini's *Il Libro dell'Arte*, named *Treatise on Painting*, 1844, and based on a transcription published in 1821 by the Italian antiquarian Giuseppe Tambroni, she supported Vasari's theory.[33] Tambroni, however, showed nationalistic leanings by stating in his introduction to his transcription that Van Eyck was not responsible nor deserved any fame for teaching the Italians what they already knew.[34] Merrifield's work earned her a grant from the Royal Commission on the Fine Arts to examine Italian manuscripts on painting techniques.[35] This resulted in the publication of *The Art of Fresco Painting* in 1846, and *Original Treatises on the Art of Painting* in 1849—major accomplishments, as she was pioneering the field of art technological source research that had been barely touched upon until then. The first scientific experiments were simultaneously carried out on some works from the National Gallery in London. Charles Locke Eastlake (1793–1865), the National Gallery's first director, and president of the Royal Academy, published the first English translation of Goethe's *Theory of Colour*, and *Materials for a History of Oil Painting* in 1847. Although he assigned some chemical analyses to the well-known chemist and physicist Michael Faraday, he does not refer to the results in his *Materials*; nor does he mention, for example, those of the analyses (experimental and textual) by Smith and Haslam, although he praises them for their work on the St Stephen's murals.

Although both Eastlake and Merrifield have been instrumental in the development of research into art-technological sources, they were selective and limited in their interpretation as they and their contemporaries did not have the comparative materials now available, making their achievements even more impressive. It was not until 1953, when Paul Coremans, the director of the Central Laboratory of the Belgian Museums, performed the first scientific analyses on a work by Jan van Eyck, namely the Ghent

---

[32] More experiments are described in Nadolny, 'A Problem of Methodology'.

[33] Cennino Cennini, *A Treatise on Painting*, with an Introduction and Notes by Signor Tambroni, trans. Mary Philadelphia Merrifield (London, 1844).

[34] Cennini, *A Treatise on Painting*, xxvii ff.

[35] Mary M. Merrifield, *Original Treatises, Dating from the XIIth to the XVIIIth Centuries on the Arts of Painting* (New York, 1999, first published 1849) v.

Altarpiece, that a fuller understanding of Van Eyck's technical skills was achieved. Van Eyck's use of a drying oil was confirmed, but it was his meticulous build-up of paint layers from fast drying to slow drying, from opaque to transparent, that seems to be the real secret of Jan van Eyck.[36]

In 1933, Daniel V. Thompson provided an authoritative translation of Cennino Cennini's *Il Libro dell'Arte*. This was followed by *The Materials and Techniques of Medieval Painting*, in 1936.[37] Thompson combined research into technological sources with reconstructions and scientific investigation, an approach that in essence is still followed today, and was at the root of the solution of the Van Eyck mystery.

As this example illustrates, research into technological sources plays a key role within the interdisciplinary approach of technical art history. It also shows how the interpretation of primary source material can be problematic; Vasari's story dominated art-historical theory for a long time. The Art Technological Source Research study group (ATSR), established in 2002 and accepted in 2006 as the 23rd working group of the International Council of Museums Conservation Committee (ICOM-CC), has created a new platform for research into any kind of testimony, written, visual, audio, of artistic practice. Research by ATSR members centres on the importance of reconstructions of historical recipes for a better understanding of the artistic process, the changes in appearance of the artwork, as well as for a correct interpretation of primary source material itself.[38] The increasingly significant role the art-technological source researcher plays within technical art history can be demonstrated by the often crucial place contemporary textual evidence occupies in the interpretation of scientific data obtained from analyses of artworks; indeed the data need a story.

Also, the textual and visual evidence needs thorough analyses of its factual truthfulness and accuracy when describing past practice or use

---

[36] Paul Coremans, Jacques Lavalleye, and Herman Bouchery, *Les Primitifs flamands, III. Contributions à l'étude des Primitifs flamands, 2. L'Agneau Mystique au laboratoire: Examen et traitement* (Antwerp, 1953).

[37] Daniel V. Thompson, *The Craftsman's Handbook: Il Libro dell'Arte by Cennino d'Andrea Cennini* (New Haven, CT, 1933). See also Mark Clarke, *The Art of All Colours: Mediaeval Recipe Books for Painters and Illuminators* (London, 2001) for an overview of medieval treatises.

[38] Three volumes of ATSR symposium proceedings have been published: Mark Clarke, Joyce H. Townsend, and Ad Stijnman, eds., *Art of the Past: Sources and Reconstruction. Proceedings of the First Symposium of the Art Technological Source Research Study Group, Amsterdam 2004* (London, 2005); Kroustallis, Townsend, Bruquetas, Stijnman, and San Andres Moya, *Art Technology*; Erma Hermens and Joyce H. Townsend, eds., *Sources and Serendipity: Testimonies of Artists' Practice: Proceedings of the Third Symposium of the Art Technological Source Research Working Group, Glasgow 2008* (London, 2009).

of materials. 'Impossible recipes' as for example found in Theophilus's treatise ('take a two- or three-year-old goat and bind its feet together and cut a hole between its breast and stomach, in the place where its heart is, and put the crystal in there, so that it lies in its blood until it is hot. At once take it out and engrave whatever you want on it, while this heat lasts'), although meant to make the crystal easier to cut, seem to be complete fantasy. However, Theophilus gives some clues, as the crystal is described as hardened ice and the goat as a 'hot-tempered' creature, which he also uses elsewhere to harden tools, and therefore, 'although the procedure is presented mythically, it is logical'.[39]

Approaches in Modern and Contemporary Art

Technical art history as well as art-technological source research attends not only to historic artistic practice but also, and increasingly, the modern artist at work. Carol Mancusi-Ungaro, director of conservation at the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York, describes how decisions needed to be made on the conservation of Mark Rothko's ensemble of 18 paintings for the Rothko Chapel, in Houston, Texas. Rothko painted the works between 1964 and 1967, and in 1979 Mancusi-Ungaro was asked to examine the whitening which distorted the dark purple and black forms. With hardly any documentation available, she managed to find one of Rothko's assistants, Ray Kelly, whose descriptions of Rothko's methods were crucial for direct scientific analyses.[40] Next to such eyewitness accounts, artists' writings and artists' interviews, and documentation from, for example, paint manufacturers, can also provide important evidence for conservation research, and are central to technical art history.

In recent years research projects on modern artists' materials and practice—often connected with the extremely complex materiality of modern artworks, which consist of composite materials of unstable or ephemeral character, or installations containing computers and other technical multimedia to name but a few—have considerably extended

---

[39] Spike Bucklow, 'Impossible Recipes', in Hermens and Townsend, eds., *Sources and Serendipity*, 18–22.

[40] Carol Mancusi-Ungaro, 'Embracing Humility in the Shadow of the Artist', in *Personal Viewpoints: Thoughts about Paintings Conservation*, ed. Mark Leonard (Los Angeles, 2003) 85.

the necessary impact of technical art history.[41] The theme of authenticity is crucial here, with remaking, reinstalling and replicating as key issues for an ongoing and fascinating debate. The international symposium *Art, Conservation and Authenticities: Material, Concept, Context*, organized by the Art History Department of the University of Glasgow in 2007, indicated many layers of authenticity, hence the use of the plural in the title, and 'authenticity' as a composite term. The traditional identification of 'the authentic state of the object with its material constitution, linking its continued authenticity to the integrity of that physical fabric over time'[42] is increasingly marginalized due, for example, to unconventional methods in contemporary art practice, and the inclusion of contextual aspects ranging from ceremonial, ethnographic, to site-specific. It was felt that the debate on issues of authenticity in which historical and modern/contemporary art practice and conservation are usually strictly divided, showed that there are many parallel lines of thought. Bringing the two approaches together in one conference enabled us to compare and contrast theory and practice from the two different areas.

Authenticity is often connected with the context of art production, the place the work was conceived in, but also, and equally important, the location it was made for. The latter is, for historical artworks, often unacknowledged and for modern artworks a crucial part of the work itself. In his keynote address at the Glasgow conference Christian Scheidemann, a contemporary art conservator, described the controversy around the delocation of Richard Serra's *Tilted Arc* (1981–88) from its original site at the Federal Plaza in New York City, to a government parking lot in Brooklyn. Serra stated that 'to remove *Tilted Arc* is . . . to destroy it'.[43] Scheidemann describes the conservator's responsibility 'towards the integrity of the work at hand, how sensitive we need to be to all its facets: its concept, physical materials and historical, cultural significance'.[44]

---

[41] See amongst others: Ijsbrand Hummelen and Dionne Sillé, *Modern Art: Who Cares* (Amsterdam 1999).

[42] Foreword to *Art, Conservation and Authenticities*, ed. Erma Hermens and Tina Fiske (London 2010) ix.

[43] See Martha Buskirk and Clara Weyergraf-Serra, eds., *The Destruction of 'Tilted Arc': Documents* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1990) 67.

[44] Christian Scheidemann, 'Authenticity: How to get there?', in Hermens and Fiske, eds., *Art, Conservation and Authenticities*, 3–12.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed some of the key facets that constitute the field of technical art history, which aims at a thorough understanding of the physical object in terms of original intention, choice of materials and techniques, as well as the context in and for which the work was created, its meaning and its contemporary perception. At its least imaginative, technical art history becomes a taxonomic act of deconstruction: a material text analysed and fragmentized. However, at its most wide ranging it embraces every aspect of artistic production, from pigment trade and manufacturing to Rembrandt's idiosyncratic techniques and Duchamp's use of ready-mades: 'It acknowledges—celebrates—the artist at work and the act of making.'[45]

   In his introduction to *The Materials and Techniques of Medieval Painting* Daniel V. Thompson presented the notion that style and technique are closely connected, and pointed at the relevance of a thorough understanding of materials and techniques for an in-depth interpretation of art: 'I have developed…the thesis that style and technique are inseparable and that this inquiry into cookery, this sojourn in the kitchen, would be unwarranted if it did not lead to some slightly more keen or intelligent appreciation of the finished dishes.'[46] Indeed, there is a story of making and meaning in every artwork, the story of the materials and techniques used by the artist, and of the artwork's survival—more or less unharmed—through time. Technical art-historical research into the physical object and its surrounding material culture is therefore instrumental in establishing the storyline, and, aided by scientific analysis, art-historical and art-technological source research, the plot may be revealed and the 'finished dish' more intelligently appreciated.

---

[45] David Bomford, Introduction to Hermens, Ouwerkerk, and Costaras, eds., *Looking through Paintings*, 12.
[46] Thompson, *The Craftsman's Handbook*, 9.

DIMENSIONS OF DIALOGUE:
ART HISTORY AND THE DISCOURSE OF ECONOMICS

Victor Ginsburgh and François Mairesse

A superficial view of the relations between economists and art historians reveals very little. Intellectual training, as well as the job opportunities that follow, appear to have little in common. Art history is not taught in the economics curriculum, and economics is not taught to students of art history. Economists consider art history as descriptive. Their often heavy use of mathematics, statistics and econometrics, and the very idea that economists look at (and study) paintings by Raphael or Van Eyck as if they were commodities carrying a price tag, is not easy to admit for an art historian.

Though there now exists a burgeoning field called 'economics of the arts', or 'cultural economics', as well as several specialized journals, handbooks, and volumes of selected readings, these are hardly accessible to art historians who lack basic training in economics.[1] University degrees in cultural economics and entrepreneurship, or in the economics and management of the arts, are flourishing as well. They essentially concentrate on arts management and deal very little with art history or aesthetics, but may hopefully attract art historians or philosophers, bridging the gap between disciplines and offering new job opportunities.

In this chapter, it is impossible to do more than a brief survey of a few issues that could be of interest to art history, but we also hope that the many references will provide some guidance for the reader. The chapter is organized around topics, and does not necessarily follow chronological order.

---

[1] See Mark Blaug, ed., *The Economics of the Arts: Selected Readings* (London, 1976); Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby, eds., *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture* (Amsterdam, 2006); Ruth Towse, ed., *A Handbook of Cultural Economics* (Cheltenham, 2003). Principal academic journals include the *Journal of Cultural Economics*; *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*; *Museum Management and Curatorship,* and the *International Journal of Arts Management.*

Some Historical Precursors

The two landmarks of art history and economics, Johann J. Winckelmann's *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (1764) and Adam Smith's *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776) are almost contemporaneous. This should have paved the way to a good understanding between the two emerging disciplines. Unfortunately, it did not, though most forefathers of the science that came to be called 'economics' made forays into 'art': Jean Bodin (1530–1596), Bernard Mandeville (1670–1733), David Hume (1711–1776), Adam Smith (1723–1790), Anne Robert Jacques Turgot (1727–1781), Ferdinand Galiani (1728–1787), Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), David Ricardo (1772–1823), John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), Stanley Jevons (1835–1882), Alfred Marshall (1842–1924) and Lionel Robbins (1898–1984), a would-be artist. Even the great John Maynard Keynes (1887–1946), an active member of the Bloomsbury Group, and therefore close to Roger Fry, Clive Bell and other art theorists and artists, was of course interested, but contributed little to the question.[2]

Of course, at least before Marshall, these were times at which economics was closer to philosophy, and it is not surprising that great thinkers dealt with economics *and* the arts. Most of them were concerned with art as a 'luxury', or as the object of 'conspicuous consumption'; prices; talent needed to create; 'progress' in the arts; why people buy art; why competition is needed; exorbitant rewards (already); copyright; public support for the arts (or its regressive nature, since, anyway, art is for the rich); or the moral utility of the arts: but aesthetics and art history were far from being important in the discussion.[3]

Smith's complex way of thinking, since he contributed to philosophy, economics and artistic production, led to the logic of the *ratio* being

---

[2] This is what Sir Roy Harrod (1900–1978), professor of economics at Oxford, writes in his biography of Keynes: 'Maynard was infected by the enthusiasm, and, in due course, became a buyer of pictures and books. His flair for the subject is testified by the value of his collection of modern pictures (£ 30,000 at his death in 1982) which he bought, for the most part, at very modest prices.' Roy Harrod, *The Life of John Maynard Keynes* (London, 1951) 180.

[3] For a good survey, see Craufurd Goodwin, 'Art and Culture in the History of Economic Thought', in *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby (Amsterdam, 2006) 25–68. The paper by Neil De Marchi, 'Reluctant Partners: Aesthetic and Market Value, 1708–1871', in *Sublime Economy*, ed. Jack Amariglio, Steven Cullenberg and Joseph Childers (London, 2008) 95–111 describes some relations between aesthetic value and economic thought starting with Adam Smith.

pushed to its very limits by Bentham, and his well-known comparison of the arts to the game of push-pin:

> The utility of all these arts and sciences, the value which they possess, is exactly in proportion to the pleasure they yield. Every other species of pre-eminence which may be attempted to be established among them is altogether fanciful. Prejudice apart, the game of push-pin is of equal value with the arts and sciences of music and poetry. If the game of push-pin furnish more pleasure, it is more valuable than either. Everybody can play at push-pin: poetry and music are relished only by a few.[4]

David Hume (1711–1776) and Stanley Jevons are among those who are closest to art history and philosophy. Hume's essay 'Of the Standard of Taste', published in 1757, and probably at the origin of the notion of 'the test of time', generated many subsequent books and papers on aesthetics.[5] Jevons was an aesthete, who 'acknowledges having had a profound aesthetic experience while seeming unwilling to incorporate the artistic dimensions of life into economics'.[6] He suggests that to make unsophisticated people benefit from the arts, these should be imposed on them, since aesthetic experience cannot be anticipated.

  Craufurd Goodwin has singled out three historical figures in the field of the arts who challenged the general laissez-faire ambience in Great Britain in the late nineteenth century: the poet and essayist Matthew Arnold (1822–1888), William Morris (1834–1896), an artist associated with the Pre-Raphaelites, who became the leader of the Arts and Crafts movement, and the art critic and art historian John Ruskin (1819–1900).[7] Arnold was afraid that economic development was destructive and would lead to anarchy, which could be avoided by actions such as 'the cultivation of the arts and culture through a liberal education'.[8] Though Morris became a well-to-do businessman, he 'believed that the arts could prosper only under conditions of collective ownership of the means of production, either through conversion to a socialist state or through a communist revolution'.[9] There were less famous people who also contributed to the discussion. While

---

[4] Bentham, cited by Goodwin in Ginsburgh and Throsby, eds., *The Handbook*, 43.

[5] David Hume, 'Of the Standard of Taste', in David Hume, *Of the Standard of Taste and Other Essays* (1757) ed., John W. Lenz (Indianapolis, IN, 1965). For a revisiting of Hume's idea see Anthony Savile, *The Test of Time. An Essay in Philosophical Aesthetics* (Oxford, 1982).

[6] Goodwin in Ginsburgh and Throsby, eds., *The Handbook*, 54.

[7] Goodwin in Ginsburgh and Throsby, eds., *The Handbook*, 49–52.

[8] Goodwin in Ginsburgh and Throsby, eds., *The Handbook*, 50.

[9] Goodwin in Ginsburgh and Throsby, eds., *The Handbook*, 52.

he was an assistant-librarian at the British Museum, Edward Edwards (1812–1886), for example, wrote an appeal to support the arts in general and museums in particular.[10]

Ruskin was already well known as an art critic when he embarked on a crusade against the prevailing economics. He rejected the 'laissez-faire' motto of the time; markets alone could not ensure that consumers made the best use of the goods that were offered to them, unless they were educated to do it.[11] Needless to say, at the time, the economics profession ignored his recommendations, though Ruskin's social and political thinking, which tries to construct links between the arts, nature and ethics, had an influence on the British Labour Party, as well as on Gandhi. With the exception of Marxist art historians, Ruskin is one of the very few with original economic ideas and arguments, some of which art historians could still endorse today.[12]

Public Support for the Arts: A Contemporary View

Ruskin's views are, to a certain degree, represented in some of the arguments that economists invoke today for subsidies for the arts, since competitive markets fail to provide enough of them. Most economists argue for supplying *more* art, but little is known about whether this support also enhances the quality supplied: Does greater support coincide with 'better' art? Here is a non-exhaustive list of the most important economic rationalizations for such support.[13]

---

[10] Edward Edwards, *The Fine Arts in England; their State and Prospects considered relatively to National Education: Part 1: Administrative Economy of the Fine Arts* (London, 1840). Edwards was not the first to ask the state to support the arts, Leibniz had already done so. See William Schupbach, 'Some Cabinets of Curiosities in European Academic Institutions', in *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth Century Europe*, ed. Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor (Oxford, 1985) 176–7. Similar pleas were made during the French Revolution in favour of the Louvre and of the Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers in Paris. See Dominique Poulot, *Musée, Nation, Patrimoine* (Paris, 1997).

[11] See John Ruskin, *A Joy Forever* (1857) (London, 1904) and Ruskin, *Unto this Last* (1862) (London, 1985).

[12] See Georgyi Plekhanov, *Art and Social Life* ed., Andrew Rothenstein, trans. Eric Hartley and Eleanor Fox (London, 1953); Nicos Hadjinicolaou, *Histoire de l'art et lutte des classes* (Paris, 1973); Frederick Antal, *Florentine Painting and its Social Background: The Bourgeois Republic before Cosimo de' Medici's Advent to Power: XIV and Early XV Centuries* (London, 1948); Arnold Hauser, *The Social History of Art* (1951), 4 vols. (London, 1999).

[13] See, however, William Grampp, *Pricing the Priceless: Art, Artists and Economics* (New York, 1989) for an entertaining rebuttal of all the arguments.

(a) The most frequently invoked argument is that art, whatever its form, is a public good. It benefits not only those who attend or see it, and who pay for it, but also benefits all other consumers, who do not necessarily wish to contribute voluntarily to its production or to its preservation (sometimes because they are not yet born). Every citizen can benefit from seeing a sculpture in a public park, but some have to pay for it, while others do not. If the arts are left to the market, they will not be priced correctly, and will thus be underproduced (in the performing or visual arts) or not saved for future generations (museums and heritage in general). Therefore, public support is needed. Artistic activities also produce 'services' that cannot be sold on the marketplace, such as civilizing effects, national pride, prestige, and identity, and social cohesion, which, supposedly, benefit all consumers.

(b) Art is a 'merit' good, that is, a good that the public sector should provide free or cheaply, since otherwise its consumption would be too low, though consumers would like to consume more. Since consumers are not fully informed, they are unable to evaluate all its benefits without public intervention, and 'the public would benefit from a more educated taste'.[14]

(c) For equity reasons, art should be made available also to low-income consumers who cannot afford to pay. Poor artists should likewise be supported.

(d) Culture is transmitted by education and from parents to children. Since parents can hardly be considered as purely altruistic, an additional market failure is generated, which needs support for efficiency (and equity) reasons.[15]

(e) The arts are also said to yield 'externalities' on other sectors of the economy. Old castles, well-known opera houses or orchestras, exhibitions and art festivals or fairs attract visitors and tourists. So do museums with good collections, while newly constructed museums are claimed to contribute to city renewal (an argument used, for instance, to attract public support for the Bilbao Guggenheim). This is supposed to have spillover effects on hotels, nearby restaurants and shops, generate new activities and came to be called the 'arts multiplier'. One dollar spent by the state

---

[14] Tibor Scitovsky, 'What's Wrong with the Arts is What's Wrong with Society', *American Economic Review* 62 (1972) 62–9.

[15] See Luc Champarnaud, Victor Ginsburgh, and Philippe Michel, 'Can Public Arts Education Replace Arts Subsidization?' *Journal of Cultural Economics* 32 (2008) 109–26.

to attract visitors generates more than one dollar of other expenditure by those visitors.

There are however also negative aspects that have been discussed. Forty-five thousand monuments are listed in France, and this number is increasing every year, without much legal possibility to drop a monument once it is listed. In the United Kingdom, there are 40,000 scheduled monuments and sites and 500,000 listed buildings. Maintaining this heritage obviously implies costs, and these costs are increasing. The number of specialists who are able to reconstruct and restore is dwindling, the materials needed are becoming rare and often expensive to extract, and monuments deteriorate at an increasing rate, since they are visited more often, and are subject to pollution.[16] The decision to list heritage sites less often will have to be made, and perhaps also the decision to drop monuments and allow their demolition. Property rights may have to be redefined to induce private owners to care for their properties, and polls or even referenda may be needed to elicit preferences and help decision makers.[17]

The number of museums also increased dramatically in recent years, and so have collections, generating serious constraints on exhibition space, with as much as 80 to 90% of the works not shown (97% in the case of the Art Institute in Chicago).[18] Should these works be kept in storage forever, or should museums be allowed to de-accession? Should museums charge entrance fees?[19] Curiously enough, the French, whose successive governments claim to have the largest budgets to support the arts, insist that museums should charge visitors, and they generally do so, while free admission to the six British national museums was reintroduced in 2001. How would the management of museums be affected if the value of their collections were considered as capital that could perhaps be used otherwise and make the population better off?[20] Should museums

---

[16] See Françoise Benhamou, *L'économie de la culture* (Paris, 2003) 58–64.

[17] For a recent survey of the issues, see Alan Peacock and Ilde Rizzo, *The Heritage Game: Economics, Policy and Practice* (Oxford, 2008).

[18] The forms used by contemporary art (e.g. installations) make this constraint even more severe.

[19] For an extended discussion, see François Mairesse, *Le droit d'entrer au musée* (Brussels, 2005).

[20] There is a large literature on the economics of museums, starting with the paper by Alan Peacock and Charles Godfrey, 'The Economics of Museums and Galleries', *Lloyds Bank Review* 111 (1974) 17–28. See the important volume on the management of American museums by Martin Feldstein, ed., *The Economics of Art Museums* (Chicago, IL, 1991) as well as a recent survey by Bruno Frey and Stephan Meier, 'The Economics of Museums',

be transformed into temporary exhibition halls? How should museums (as well as many other cultural institutions) be evaluated? Their output (or success) can obviously not be measured by profits, nor by the number of visitors alone, as has often been suggested, and done. According to the ICOM definition, a museum 'acquires, conserves, researches and communicates, and exhibits for the purpose of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment'. This makes for an activity with multiple outputs, and measuring its performance calls for the use of appropriate economic methods.[21]

The last argument for subsidization, which applies more specifically to the performing arts, is based on the difficulty or impossibility of achieving productivity gains. It was put forward more than thirty years ago and came to be known as the Baumol cost disease.[22] It can be briefly stated as follows: since wages escalate in sectors other than culture, they must also do so in the performing arts to make these attractive enough for artists to enter, but since no productivity gains are possible, wage increases have to be passed fully to prices. Therefore the relative price of the performing arts increases and, unless subsidized—or supported by donors and private funds—the sector will shrink and eventually disappear.[23]

Government intervention may be channelled under several forms. It can be direct, since some art institutions or companies are state-owned, but even if this is not the case, the state, regional authorities or municipalities can provide direct subsidies, allow tax deduction for charitable contributions, gifts or bequests by firms or individuals,[24] or even provide consumers with vouchers that give them the right to attend cultural events. A less direct form of intervention is regulation, such as protecting

---

in Ginsburgh and Throsby, eds., *The Handbook*, 1017–50. See also the iconoclastic view by William Grampp, 'A Colloquy about Art and Museums: Economics Engages Museology', in *Economics of the Arts: Selected Essays*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and Pierre-Michel Menger (Amsterdam, 1996) 221–73.

[21] See François Mairesse and Philippe Vanden Eeckaut, 'Museum Assessment and FDH Technology: Towards a Global Approach', *Journal of Cultural Economics* 26 (2002) 1017–50.

[22] William Baumol and William Bowen, *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma* (New York, 1966).

[23] It is worth quoting the (now) standard argument by Baumol and Bowen: 'The output per man-hour of the violinist playing a Schubert quartet . . . is relatively fixed, and it is fairly difficult to reduce the number of actors necessary for a performance of Henry IV, Part II' (164). Note that this argument has often been refuted, since performing artists of all kinds can now also benefit from derived products, such as records or T-shirts.

[24] See John O'Hagan, *The State and the Arts: An Analysis of Key Economic Issues in Europe and the United States* (Cheltenham, 1998).

artists against being plagiarized, or against alterations or destruction of their works, or ensuring financial rewards to living artists and to their heirs during as much as 70 years after their death under the form of copyright or resale rights. The ubiquity of copyright has led to a very large literature, at the confines of law and economics. Its economic justification is based on the idea that it provides incentives to create, and that the absence of protection would lead to underproduction—the same idea is used to justify protection of industrial patents. Obviously, regulation has led to overregulation, probably driven by the rent-seeking behaviour of author societies that collect transaction fees, much more than by artists themselves.[25]

Economists and the Arts. Incursions into Art History

Economics is also making (sometimes imperialistic) forays in other fields, such as history. Quantitative economic history or 'cliometrics', widely adopted by the École des Annales in the 1920s, is now a respected science, which even has, since 1993, its Nobel Prize winners, William Fogel and Douglass North, as well as its journals. Art history can also be looked at in a more quantitative way.

Peter Burke is one of those who came very close to this.[26] John Michael Montias (1928–2005), a Yale economist turned famous art historian, respected for his work on Vermeer and on Dutch Golden Age painting, took the lead in analysing art history in a manner parallel to the École des Annales approach to general history.[27] Instead of analysing leading figures and facts, his work centres on ordinary people.[28] In his analysis of seventeenth-century Dutch art collectors in Amsterdam, he illustrates

---

[25] See William Landes and Richard Posner, *The Economic Structure of Intellectual Property Law* (Cambridge, MA and London, 2003) and Simon Stokes, *Art and Copyright* (Oxford, 2003).

[26] See Peter Burke, *The Italian Renaissance: Culture and Society in Italy* (Princeton, NJ, 1986).

[27] John Michael Montias, *Vermeer and His Milieu: A Web of Social History* (Princeton, NJ, 1989). In his review of the book in *The New York Times*, the art critic John Russell wrote that Montias had 'proved that there is a great deal more to art history than shuffling slides in a library', see Kathryn Shattuck, Obituary for Montias on 1 August 2005 (http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/01/arts/design/01montias.html, accessed 15 September 2010). See also John Michael Montias, *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-economic Study of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton, NJ, 1982).

[28] 'His work opened the door for a new genre of art history in which artists were analysed in the context of their societal and economic surroundings and not merely their

how quantitative methods can be used in art history.[29] In another strand of research, he uses archives that had not been brought to light before, and examines the intricate relations between artists, art dealers and their patrons. He showed that most dealers were only modestly successful. They relied on friends, business and religious acquaintances, and their families for their working capital, of which they seemed to be in constant need. They also relied on auctions to replenish or empty their inventories, but since auctions were mainly visited by in-town buyers, room was left for arbitrage between more distant cities. Their role in dealing in works by the major artists of their time seems also to have been quite limited. Much work in this direction has also been undertaken in papers jointly written by the economist Neil de Marchi and the art historian Hans Van Miegroet. Their research into copies (see below), early auction markets, and more generally on economic art history, should be singled out for its importance. [30]

Artworks are, with some exceptions, heterogeneous. Each creation is unique and markets can hardly be analysed by the standard supply-demand mechanism. This has led economists to study:

(a) whether the returns obtained on artworks outperform those of financial markets;
(b) what can be said about the characteristics or properties that determine values;
(c) why tastes change;
(d) whether art-historical values change;
(e) careers of artists;
(f) the status of copies and fakes.

(a) *Financial returns on art.* Though the idea was discussed earlier, the paper by Baumol on the financial returns of art, published in 1986, was probably one of the most influential studies, since the conclusions were

works.' Kathryn Shattuck, 'John Montias, 76, Scholar of Economics and of Art', *The New York Times*, 1 August 2005, 13.

[29] John Michael Montias, 'Quantitative Methods in the Analysis of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Inventories', in Ginsburgh and Menger, eds., *Economics of the Arts*, 1–26.

[30] Neil De Marchi and Hans Van Miegroet, 'The History of Art Markets', in Ginsburgh and Throsby, eds., *The Handbook*, 69–123; Neil De Marchi, 'Auctioning Paintings in late Seventeenth-Century London', in *Economics of Art and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh (Amsterdam, 2004) 97–128.

based on a very long series of prices (1650–1960) collected by Reitlinger.[31] Baumol found that the average real rate of return was equal to 0.55% per year, some 2% lower than the return on bonds. The difference can, according to Baumol, be attributed to the return provided by aesthetic pleasure. Financial returns on works of art have been analysed very often, and results vary wildly across time and types of works.[32]

(b) *The characteristics or properties of art.* Values are determined by the name (or the reputation) of the artist, but this explains little, and one should understand why reputations differ, and what makes a painting 'good' or 'bad'. Breaking down 'quality' in terms of (hopefully) objective characteristics should be possible. After all, this is what, back in 1708, the French art historian de Piles had in mind when he wrote that 'the true understanding of painting consists in knowing whether a picture is good or bad, in distinguishing between that which is good in a certain work and that which is bad, and in giving reasons for one's judgment'.[33] This led him to grade, on a scale of twenty, characteristics such as composition, drawing, colour and expression, for a group of painters, and to rank them accordingly. Though de Piles himself looked on this as a game, his contemporaries considered it a 'clever way of characterizing genius'.[34] Later, this view changed, and art historians and philosophers expressed very strong objections against such views. Julius von Schlosser hated the idea of a ranking.[35] Gombrich describes the exercise as a 'notorious aberration'.[36] In his book on de Piles's theory of art, Puttfarken thought of de Piles as having been 'at his worst when he tried to be most systematic'.[37]

Economists who are used to working on quality differentiation have found de Piles's work to provide them with an agreeable playground

---

[31] William Baumol, 'Unnatural Values: or Art Investment as a Floating Crap Game', *American Economic Review* 76 (1986) 10–14; Gerald Reitlinger, *The Economics of Taste: The Rise and Fall of the Picture Market, 1760–1960* 3 vols. (London, 1960–70).

[32] See Bruno Frey and Reiner Eichenberger, 'On the Rate of Return in the Art Market: Survey and Evaluation', *European Economic Review* 39 (1995) 529–37 and Victor Ginsburgh, Michael Moses and Jianping Mei, 'The Computation of Art Indices in Art', in Ginsburgh and Throsby, *The Handbook*, 947–82.

[33] Roger de Piles, *Cours de peinture par principes* (1708) (Paris, 1992), trans. Jakob Rosenberg, *On Quality in Art* (London, 1969) 33.

[34] Jacques Thuillier, Préface to Piles, *Cours de peinture*, xxvii.

[35] Julius von Schlosser, *Die Kunstliteratur: Ein Handbuch zur Quellenkunde der neueren Kunstgeschichte* (Vienna, 1924).

[36] Ernst Gombrich, *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (London, 1966) 76.

[37] Thomas Puttfarken, *Roger de Piles' Theory of Art* (New Haven, CT, 1985) 42.

and analyse his *balance des peintres* in a number of ways, generally using econometrics. Davenport and Studdert-Kennedy were followed by Mairesse, who tried to connect de Piles's scores, the number of lines devoted by him to the same painters in his *Abrégé de la Peinture*, as well as the number of paintings in the royal collection.[38] Mairesse suggests that the three groups of variables are correlated. Ginsburgh and Weyers have drawn on this intuition to show (i) that de Piles's scores in the *balance* are only mildly reflected in his other writings and that colour comes out only as a weak and unconvincing explanation of the space he devotes to individual artists in his *Abrégé*; (ii) that his *Abrégé* is more closely related to the number of paintings in the royal collection; (iii) that Félibien des Avaux, the (allegedly) traditionalist art historian who became a member of the Royal Academy much earlier than de Piles, was less in agreement with the tastes of the king than was de Piles; and (iv) that de Piles pre-dicted in a much better way than Félibien and the Academy, who were the painters who would pass the test of time (colourists and Rubenism vs. draughtsmen and Poussinism).[39]

It is interesting to point out that this breakdown of the 'total value' of an object (be it a painting or a more down-to-earth object such as an auto-mobile), into more basic characteristics was also suggested in economics by Kevin Lancaster and became popularized in many papers as 'hedonic pricing'.[40] This provided another point of convergence between art his-tory, art philosophy and economics.[41]

(c) *Taste.* Tastes do indeed change, and prices commanded by works of art often follow this movement. There are many examples of painters who

---

[38] Michael Davenport and Gerald Studdert-Kennedy, 'The Balance of Roger de Piles: A Statistical Analysis', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32 (1974) 493–502; François Mairesse, 'Réflexion sur la balance des peintres de Roger de Piles', *Recherches Poïétiques* 8 (1999) 43–9.

[39] Victor Ginsburgh and Sheila Weyers, 'De Piles, Drawing and Color. An Essay in Quantitative Art History', *Artibus et Historiae* 45 (2002) 101–14; Victor Ginsburgh and Sheila Weyers, 'On the Contemporaneousness of Roger de Piles' Balance des Peintres', in Amariglio, Cullenberg and Childers, eds., *Sublime Economy*, 112–23. See also Neil De Marchi, 'Reluctant Partners: Aesthetic and Market Value, 1708–1871', in Amariglio, Cullenberg and Childers, eds., *Sublime Economy*, 95–111. De Marchi's paper also discusses how the portrait-ist and art theorist Jonathan Richardson contributed to the debate, and suggested changes in de Piles's ratings.

[40] Kevin Lancaster, 'A new approach to consumer theory', *Journal of Political Economy* 74 (1966) 132–57.

[41] See George Dickie, *Evaluating Art* (Philadelphia, PA, 1988) or Bruce Vermazen, 'Com-paring Evaluations of Works of Art', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 34 (1975) 7–14.

have been 'rediscovered', including Botticelli, Vermeer, Goya or the Pre-Raphaelites. This is illustrated in Haskell's famous work on artistic rediscoveries.[42] It is unclear whether such changes are due to fads or fashion, or to more fundamental reasons. Grampp suggests that the rapid succession of styles in contemporary art is due to the rapid increase of income, and to consumers 'who seek novelty more often than they would if their income was lower'.[43] Economists have, to our knowledge, never seriously investigated the issue of changing tastes.[44]

(d) *Changes in art-historical values.* Changes in art-historical values have of course also been examined very often, but it is difficult to distinguish these from changes in taste. Some recent quantitative work analysing artistic canons gives a different perception from that given by Haskell, since it shows that there is much more stability than is thought. A large number of Italian Renaissance or Flemish Old Masters who are celebrated today were already present and highly praised in Vasari's *Vite* and Van Mander's *Schilder-boek*, and, though some may have disappeared from what Westphal calls the 'first circle of the canon', they were never forgotten by art historians.[45]

(e) *Careers of artists.* In a series of publications the Chicago economist David Galenson studied the careers and life cycles of Impressionist and modern French and American painters and consistently found that some

---

[42] See Francis Haskell, *Rediscoveries in Art: Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and in France* (London, 1980) for an account of these changes in France and in the United Kingdom from the late eighteenth century to the early 1920s.

[43] William Grampp, *Pricing the Priceless: Art, Artists and Economics* (New York, 1989) 66–8.

[44] At least empirically. George Stigler and Gary Becker, 'De gustibus non est disputandum', *American Economic Review* 67 (1977) 76–90 have developed a theory of changing tastes in the neoclassical framework of unchanging preferences, by introducing the notion of positive and negative addiction (music and smoking). Addiction (if positive) should enhance the role of education to culture. More education would certainly lead to more participation in cultural activities (see Louis Bergonzi and Julia Smith, *Effects of Arts Education on Participation in the Arts* (Santa Ana, CA, 1996)) and, therefore, to less need for public support. It would also increase efficiency, since we would have to accept that consumers possess the knowledge and have the right to choose in a sovereign way, and accept the consequences to which this could lead.

[45] Merold Westphal, 'The Canon as Flexible, Normative Fact', *The Monist* 76 (1993) 436–49. See Victor Ginsburgh, François Mairesse and Sheila Weyers, 'De la narration à la consécration: L'exemple de la peinture flamande de Van Eyck à Rubens', *Histoire et Mesure* 23 (2008) 145–1276, as well as James Cutting, *Impressionism and its Canon* (Lanham, MD, 2006).

artists bloom early, while others produce their best works later during their life cycle.[46] The two types of careers are related to innovative behaviour. In Galenson and Jensen, the approach is extended to old masters.[47] 'Conceptual' artists, who bloom early:

> communicate specific ideas or emotions. Their goals for a particular work can usually be stated precisely, before its production . . . [and] consequently [they] often make detailed preparatory sketches or plans. . . . [T]hey think of it as primarily making a preconceived image, and [the execution is] often simply a process of transferring an image they have already created from one surface to another.

'Experimental' artists, on the other hand, bloom late. They are:

> motivated by aesthetic criteria [and aim] at presenting visual perceptions. Their goals are imprecise, so their procedure is tentative and incremental. [They] rarely feel they have succeeded, and their careers are consequently often dominated by the pursuit of a single objective. . . . They rarely make specific preparatory sketches or plans for a painting.[48]

The idea that some artists bloom early, while others are late, and that artists may follow two paths in their creative work seems very reasonable. What is less so, and is contradicted by many art historians and philosophers, is the association between age and type of creativity and the dichotomous behaviour of being either conceptual or experimental; most artists are both at different times in their careers and even at the same moment in different works.[49]

(f) *Copies and fakes.* Economists have also become interested in the status and prices of copies (to be distinguished from fakes), which have likewise varied over time. While copies were close substitutes for originals during the seventeenth century, and priced accordingly at about half the price of

---

[46] David Galenson, *Painting Outside the Lines: Patterns of Creativity in Modern Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2001).

[47] David Galenson and Robert Jensen, 'Young Geniuses and Old Masters: The Life Cycles of Great Artists from Masaccio to Jasper Johns', *NBER Working Paper 8368* National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) in Cambridge, MA, (July 2001).

[48] Quotations are taken from David Galenson, *The Life Cycles of Modern Artists: Theory, Measurement, and Implications*, unpublished manuscript, 2003.

[49] See Victor Ginsburgh and Sheila Weyers, 'Creation and Life Cycles of Artists', *Journal of Cultural Economics* 30 (2006) 91–107, for a critical assessment of Galenson's views. Psychologists have also intensively worked on creation. See in particular Dean Simonton, *Genius and Creativity: Selected Papers* (New York, 1997). For more recent papers, see his website http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/simonton/ (accessed 15 September 2010).

originals, as illustrated by De Marchi and Van Miegroet,[50] they are barely considered to have any value nowadays. This contradicts the fact that some scholars hardly see any aesthetic distinction between a copy and an original.[51] Moreover some copies or forgeries, for example the Ossianic epics (a forgery due to James Macpherson, an eighteenth-century poet who 'attributed' the work to the third-century Celtic bard Ossian), had an enormous influence on late eighteenth-century European literature and art.[52]

This short survey is centred on the visual arts, but economists have also become interested in other art forms. Scherer uses microeconomic theory and some econometrics to analyse a sample of 646 musical composers born between 1650 and 1849, and present in the *Schwann Guide*.[53] One of his most important contributions is on geographical and political determinants. He contradicts the 'competing courts hypothesis' suggested by Norbert Elias and, independently, by William and Hilda Baumol, that in Germany and Italy there were dozens of courts and cities competing for prestige and thus for musicians, so that every local court had its orchestra, and the more affluent ones even had an opera house.[54] Scherer shows that even though Germany had the largest number of local courts, it ranked only third (after Austria and Czechoslovakia, which were both more centralized) once the number of composers is related to population. Thus he argued that the prevalence of music in Austria and Czechoslovakia was probably due to the schooling system, in which schoolmasters, even in small villages, were expected to teach singing and violin to their pupils. Good advice for those who belittle arts education in our world.

---

[50] See Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet, 'Pricing Invention: Originals, Copies and their Relative Value in Seventeenth-Century Art Markets', in Ginsburgh and Menger, eds., *Economics of the Arts*, 26–67.

[51] Jack Meiland, 'Originals, Copies, and Aesthetic Value', in *The Forger's Art: Forgery and the Philosophy of Art*, ed. Denis Dutton (Berkeley, CA, 1983) 122–3, claims that 'if what a great work of art does is to present us with a new vision of the world, then an exact copy can perform exactly the same function'.

[52] For a recent overview, see Françoise Benhamou and Victor Ginsburgh, 'Copies of Artworks: The Case of Paintings and Prints', in Ginsburgh and Throsby, eds., *The Handbook*, 253–84.

[53] Frederic M. Scherer, *Quarter Notes and Bank Notes: The Economics of Music Composition in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (Princeton, NJ, 2004).

[54] Norbert Elias, *Mozart: Zur Soziologie eines Genies* (Frankfurt am Main, 1991); William Baumol and Hilda Baumol, 'On the Economics of Musical Composition in Mozart's Vienna', *Journal of Cultural Economics* 18 (1994) 171–98.

Artists and Art Historians in the Marketplace

A popular theme is that most artists are poor—or have a lower income than the average consumer—and die poor, while salerooms, their dealers, and editors become rich. Using the 1980 US Census data, Filer concluded that, on average, artists do not earn any less than they would in non-artistic employment.[55] It was later shown, however, that this is due to multiple job holdings, including in non-artistic activities.[56] If these extra jobs are not accounted for, artists' average incomes are smaller than those of workers with a comparable education. It is also said that artists devote less time than others to their main occupation, that they may have to go to lower-paid jobs to supplement their income, that their earnings are more variable and less directly influenced by education than those of other workers. To explain why artists accept this income differential, one has to appeal to differences in motivation; Throsby, for example, suggests that 'the primary desire to create art as a principal occupation must be recognized as the essential driving force behind an artist's labour supply decisions'.[57]

But the income distribution of artists is also markedly skewed and there exist superstars, whose earnings are impressive. In a highly cited paper, Sherwin Rosen has shown that talent alone does not explain these differences. His model shows that small differences in talent may result in large differences in income.[58] This is compounded by the fact that there is little, if any, substitution between various degrees of talent, or between quality and quantity. As Rosen points out, 'hearing a succession of mediocre singers does not add up to a single outstanding performance'.

Relations between art historians and markets can be traced back to the sixteenth century, and it is notable that the first art historians (Vasari's *Vite*, 1550, 1568) or museologists (Quiccheberg, 1565) were active not only

---

[55] Randall Filer, 'The Starving Artist: Myth or Reality? Earnings of Artists in the United States', *Journal of Political Economy* 94 (1986) 56–75.

[56] See Gregory Wassal and Neil Alper, 'Toward A Unified Theory of the Determinants of the Earnings of Artists', in *Cultural Economics*, ed. Ruth Towse and Abdul Kakhee (Heidelberg, 1992) 187–200. See also the recent surveys by Neil Alper and Gregory Wassal, 'Artist's Careers and their Labor Markets', in Ginsburgh and Throsby, *The Handbook*, 813–64 and by Pierre Michel Menger, 'Artistic Labor Markets: Contingent Work, Excess Supply and Occupational Risk Management', in Ginsburgh and Throsby, *The Handbook*, 765–812.

[57] David Throsby, 'The Production and Consumption of the Arts: A View of Cultural Economics', *Journal of Economic Literature* 23 (1994) 1–29.

[58] Sherwin Rosen, 'The Economics of Superstars', *American Economic Review* 71 (1981) 845–58.

at the same time, but in two regions (Italy and Germany) where economic development was important, and where bankers (the Medici and the Fugger) supported the arts.[59] Later in time, art historians such as Ruskin and Aby Warburg were rich enough to do their work without being otherwise remunerated. The situation changed in the 1950s. Ernst Gombrich, and most other art historians or curators of his time, were not rich enough to support themselves.[60] They benefited from a favourable economic environment and were able to develop their science within publicly funded research or teaching institutions. Other models appear at the end of the twentieth century, such as the former director of the Metropolitan, Thomas Hoving, or the director of the Guggenheim Foundation, Thomas Krens described by Jean Clair as a 'Spieler à la Dostoyevsky'.[61] Their much more entrepreneurial style may have paved the way for new ways of dealing with art, such as 'decentralizing' the Louvre to Abu Dhabi. But the market is not keen on providing careers for all art historians, and many have jobs (including as tourist guides) that have little to do with what they were exposed to during their studies. Not every art historian is lucky enough to become a superstar like Ernst Gombrich, with his *Story of Art*, or Harald Szeemann, the travelling salesman of art exhibitions.[62]

Beside teaching, conferences and writing papers and books, which usually go together, it is worth singling out expertise and connoisseurship, that some would like to dissociate, though Friedländer would have disagreed with them. Here are his words:

> The ability to attribute and check attributions will then follow automatically from study and enjoyment. Yes, from enjoyment! Many art historians, it is true, make it their ambition to exclude pleasure from art, in which, for obvious reasons, some of them succeed too well....Reasoning based on calculations and measurements is presented as the true method. A dry approach stands high in favour. Abstruseness, involved terminology, which makes the reading of art-historical books such torture, derives from that very ambition. Sometimes there are depths, but so obscure as to be worth-

---

59 See Nicolette Brout, 'Le traité muséologique de Quiccheberg', in *L'extraordinaire jardin de la mémoire*, ed. François Mairesse (Morlanwelz, 2004) 69–135.

60 See his autobiography: Ernst Gombrich, *A Lifelong Interest: Conversations on Art and Science with Didier Eribon* (London, 1993).

61 Jean Clair, *Malaise dans les musées* (Paris, 2007) 67. See also the pamphlet of Paul Werner, *Museum, Inc.: Inside the Global Art World* (Chicago, IL, 2005); Thomas Hoving, *Making the Mummies Dance: Inside the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York, 1993).

62 See his *Écrire les expositions* (Brussels, 1996). See also Nathalie Heinich, *Harald Szeemann, un cas singulier* (Paris, 1995).

less for the reader, generally all is shallow but cunningly troubled so as to suggest depths.[63]

The work achieved by Wilhelm von Bode in Berlin, and that of Alfred Lichtwark in Hamburg are landmarks in expertise. The well-documented relationships between the art trader Joseph Duveen and Bernard Berenson have often raised eyebrows as well.[64] Federico Zeri would not have become wealthy had he not been Paul Getty's adviser.[65] Attributions, which depend on expertise, have of course a large impact on art markets. The case of the *Madonna of the Pinks* is remarkable. Until its attribution to Raphael in 1991, the painting was worth a very small amount, possibly as little as £8,000.[66] The National Gallery paid £22 million for the painting in 2004. In a well-organized market, the expert who made the final attribution should have become rich. Pierre Rosenberg's eye for *Olympos and Marsyas*, which he recognized as a Poussin, enriched a couple of lawyers who could reap the benefits of the twenty-year battle between the Louvre (which had bought the painting) and the family who sold it, being convinced by other experts that it merely was a 'school of Carracci'.[67] Experts are much sought-after by art institutions (salesrooms, antique shops, art galleries, museums), though few of them turn into superstars comparable to Berenson, Zeri or Maurice Reims, who started as an auctioneer and was eventually elected member of the Académie française.

Concluding Comments. The Stones of Venice?

If art history is narrowly defined, it seems quite distant from the concerns of economics. However, if one is willing to account for all those who have taken art history as a field and have decided to use their knowledge and to participate in art markets (including art galleries, museums, the organization of exhibitions, salesrooms, teaching, or tourism), some links are obvious. Without art history, there would be no touring of the temple of Karnak, the Chinese Great Wall, the Metropolitan, the Louvre or the

---

[63] Max Friedlaender, *From Van Eyck to Brueghel*, trans. Marguarite Kay, ed. Fritz Grossmann (London, 1956) vi. Originally published in German in 1916 as *Von Jan van Eyck bis Brueghel*.

[64] See Meryle Secrest, *Duveen. A Life in Art* (New York, 2005) and Ernest Samuels, *Bernard Berenson: The Making of a Connoisseur* (Cambridge, MA, 1979).

[65] See Federico Zeri's autobiography, *J'avoue m'être trompé* (Paris, 1995).

[66] See *The Art Newspaper* (September 2003) 9.

[67] See Michel Laclotte, *Histoires de musées: Souvenirs d'un conservateur* (Paris, 2003) 139–40.

Bilbao Guggenheim. Some architects (Frank Gehry, Jean Nouvel, and a couple of others) would be less famous. Coffee-table books would be less numerous, and attributions of works to 'Great Masters' would suffer from even more vagaries. Krzysztof Pomian suggests that art markets as we know them today could not exist without museums, and that museums need the art market: 'The two institutions are in opposition, but are also complementary; they form a system that allows individuals to establish relations with the invisible, because it circulates artworks among individuals and visitors among artworks.'[68] These examples show that markets have taken art historians on board, even if this looks strange—and undoubtedly less beautiful—than Ruskin's *Stones of Venice*.

More and more economists are wandering the streets of art and culture. We tried to give an account of these incursions, which may look somewhat idiosyncratic and personal. The books and papers referred to here contain a host of further references. We hope the reader will appreciate these 'other cultures as much as [they] can without inconveniencing [themselves], or without disorienting [themselves] and risking losing [their] identities'.[69]

---

[68] Krzysztof Pomian, 'L'art entre le musée et le marché', in *Le commerce de l'art de la Renaissance à nos jours*, ed. Laurence Bertrand Dorléac (Besançon, 1992) 31.

[69] James Elkins, *Stories of Art* (New York and London, 2002) 148, paraphrasing Stanley Fish, 'Boutique Multiculturalism, or Why Liberals are Incapable of Thinking about Hate Speech', *Critical Inquiry* 23 (1997) 378–95.

SOCIOLOGIES OF ART: WITH AND AGAINST ART HISTORY

Nathalie Heinich

Translated by Matthew Rampley

Introduction

The sociology of art is a very young discipline—scarcely three generations old—which has sometimes placed itself in competition with art history, a discipline markedly older with several centuries already behind it. This was notably the spirit in which Pierre Bourdieu, mindful of maintaining the hegemony of sociology over other disciplines, encouraged researchers around him who were working on art. He assumed, indeed even initiated a rivalry that often had the appearance of the boastfulness of a cadet keen to assert himself against his older counterpart.[1]

The position I intend to adopt differs from these; it seems to me that within the domain of knowledge these disciplines have to be considered and practised not as competitors but as complementary. Only a domineering bravado would wish to assert the superiority of one over the other; in order to leave behind the discouraging alternative of aggressive rivalry or polite indifference. It is better to specify the precise nature of each of these two disciplines, in order to affirm where they can be a source of mutual enrichment.[2]

This chapter will not be dedicated to specifying the nature of art history, of course, but rather that of the sociology of art, first of all, its historical dynamic, then its instruments, then, finally, the paths that are available to it at present.

---

[1] See Pierre Bourdieu, Postface to Erwin Panofsky, *Architecture gothique et pensée scolastique* (Paris, 1967) 135–67; Bourdieu, 'Éléments d'une théorie sociologique de la perception artistique', *Revue internationale des sciences sociales* XX.4 (1968) 640–4; Bourdieu, 'Disposition esthétique et compétence artistique', *Les Temps modernes* 295 (1971) 1345–78. On the analysis of the place of art and culture in sociology see Nathalie Heinich, *Pourquoi Bourdieu?* (Paris, 2007).
[2] See Nathalie Heinich, *Ce que l'art fait à la sociologie* (Paris, 1998).

The Dead End of a Sociology of Artworks

The principal feature that characterizes the sociology of art, which more than any other distinguishes it from art history, is that it does not, in my view, privilege the analysis of artworks. I stated 'in my view', and this is where the problem begins, for this position, which I believe is a radical one, is not shared by all my colleagues.[3] A large proportion of what is produced in France under the label of 'sociology of art' continues to revolve, in effect, around the 'sociological' explanation and interpretation of works; it aims to go beyond the 'external analysis' of institutions, publics and social status with the 'internal analysis' of artworks,[4] albeit one which, for sure, is able to supplement the tools of art historians and art critics with 'social' and 'sociological' ones.[5]

I do not hold to such an enterprise, however, because I do not think this is sociology, but a form of art history or aesthetics that one could call 'sociological aesthetics'. This is the tradition to which the work of Pierre Francastel belongs, and which was only called the 'sociology of art' in his time because the author was probably familiar with the German philosophical interpretation of sociology.[6] It was a sort of philosophy of the social, an informed interpretation that aimed at the extension of the traditional objects of philology, philosophy and aesthetics.[7] But Francastel's 'sociology of art' resembles 'sociology' as it is understood by sociologists today as little as, let us admit, André Malraux's 'history of art' resembles art history as it is currently practised.[8] This does not prevent one from reading Francastel or Malraux with interest—even pleasure—but more as moments in the history of thought than as examples to be emulated.

If we put Francastel to one side, what other examples are there of a sociology of artworks? Regrettably, few names spring to mind. Of course, Arnold Hauser, but at present his materialist attempt at painting a large canvas of artworks reflecting the economic circumstances of their

---

[3] See the special issue of *Sociologie de l'art* 10 (1997) on 'Sociologie des œuvres d'art'.

[4] On the opposition between 'internal analysis' and 'external analysis' see Antoine Hennion, *La Passion musicale. Sociologie de la médiation* (Paris, 1993).

[5] For a discussion of these positions, see the proceedings of the colloquium held in Marseille in 1985: Raymonde Moulin, ed., *Sociologie des arts* (Paris, 1986).

[6] See most notably Pierre Francastel, *Études de sociologie de l'art. Création picturale et société* (Paris, 1970).

[7] This idea was developed in Nathalie Heinich, *La Sociologie de l'art* (Paris, 2001).

[8] See André Malraux, *The Voices of Silence*, trans. Stuart Gilbert (New York, 1953). First published in French, 1951.

production is rather more a cause for amusement, since Marxism, having proved to be hardly more than a counter-ideology, can no longer claim to be 'scientific', even if it has been able, on occasion, to have some interesting scholarly effects.[9] For me two names seem to be rather less obsolete: Erwin Panofsky in relation to Gothic architecture, and Michel Foucault in relation to *Las Meninas* by Velázquez.[10] For sure, they are not sociologists, but rather practitioners of what one could call, in this case, cultural history, in a line established magisterially by Jacob Burckhardt in the nineteenth century.[11] Besides, neither of them claimed that artistic production is the 'reflection' or the 'expression' of a society; rather, in the case of one, it was a matter of demonstrating the homology or the structural identity of two cultural productions and, in the case of the other, the reversal of the power relations staged within a painting by a remarkable painter.

Why is it, then, that certain sociologists of art persist, contrary to the evidence, in claiming that the ultimate aim and privileged object of their discipline has to be the analysis of works of art and the demonstration of the ways in which, 'in the final instance', they are socially determined and the vehicles of 'social meaning'? I am thinking here once more of Pierre Bourdieu, who repeatedly stated that the vocation of the sociology of art is to defeat art history on its own terrain. Why do they persist in raising up, on the one hand, something which, on the other, they claim to put down, critiquing the 'belief' in the superior power of art while at the same time conferring on it the extraordinary ability to embody on its own the state of a society? It seems to me that the sole explanation lies in the rampant obsession with normativity that continues to inhabit a large segment of sociology (and unfortunately I am not only speaking of the sociology of art), and which is much more concerned with affirming or critiquing values than with analysing them.

This can be clearly seen in the delicate question of the autonomy of art, which is at the core of the work of Bourdieu.[12] For sure, this concept has great descriptive power, once one is engaged in tracing the progressive stages in the autonomization of an artistic practice, which depends

---

[9] Arnold Hauser, *The Social History of Art* (1951), 4 vols. (London, 1999).

[10] Erwin Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (New York, 1951); Michel Foucault, *Les Mots et les Choses* (Paris, 1966).

[11] See Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. Samuel George Chetwynd Middlemore (Harmondsworth, 2004; first publ. 1860).

[12] See notably, Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art. Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. Susan Emanuel (Cambridge, 1996).

on whether its themes are selected by its audience or by its creators, and on whether the latter are working—consciously or unconsciously—for the short-term market and the mass public, or rather more for their peers and posterity. However the concept of autonomy also has a strong normative and, in a sense, contradictory, charge, since it enables either the denunciation of attempts by artists to achieve autonomy—a classic motif of the sociology of domination—or, in contrast, praise for political engagement, in other words, their determination by external, heteronymous motivations. Here is the classic contradiction peculiar to the ideology of the avant-garde, perpetually caught between the elitist glorification of artistic uniqueness and the populist glorification of art in the service of the people.[13] Yet instead of focusing on this contradiction, many sociologists, following the Frankfurt School, perpetuate it, thanks, notably, to the notion of autonomy.[14]

The value that is attributed to works of art as a matter of principle is the key conceptual gap in sociology, because it is blinded by it; it is what the sociology of art does not see, because it is so self-evident. It is the value given to works that implicitly places the study of them at the top of the hierarchy of the objects of research, whereas there exist so many others that are no less interesting. Moreover it is this that keeps the sociology of art within the orbit of philosophy, leading it to address artistic value only in order to consider whether it is 'intrinsic' or 'extrinsic', 'particular to the work itself', or 'socially constructed'. Now this is a question that every sociologist of art should have resolved from the moment they began their profession, for if they imagine that sociology can provide some kind of answer to questions about substance, essence or transcendence, they have not yet understood what sociology is. If they think that its role is to demonstrate that human reality is not 'natural' but 'socially constructed', this is a little like the position of an astronomer proposing to demonstrate that the moon exists. Unfortunately this is the case with many self-proclaimed 'sociologists of art', who hide their lack of competence both in art and in sociology behind the prestige of their object.[15]

---

[13] This point is developed in Nathalie Heinich, *L'Élite artiste. Excellence et singularité en régime démocratique* (Paris, 2005).

[14] See Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics. The Distribution of the Sensible*, ed. and trans. Gabriel Rockhill (New York, 2006).

[15] See Nathalie Heinich, 'Pourquoi la sociologie parle des œuvres d'art, et comment elle pourrait en parler', *Sociologie de l'art* 10 (1997) 11–23.

There are, nevertheless, specifically sociological ways of dealing with the question of artistic value, by observing concrete situations into which artworks are immersed, the processes whereby actors evaluate them, the ranges of values that serve to justify preferences, regimes of valorization specific to a particular culture. This is the programme of what is called pragmatic sociology, and which is beginning to provide interesting research.[16] However, such approaches, necessarily empirical and descriptive, imply giving up stating what artistic value is 'in itself', as well as, conversely, 'demonstrating' anything about the 'social' nature of art, which is, ultimately, akin to giving up according any priority to knowing artworks, the valorized objects. In other words, it is necessary to make a truly radical break with the prehistory of our discipline. What then does the sociology of art do?

What Sociology of Art Does

Sociology of art no longer produces—or at least it should not—dissertations on the theme of 'art and society', which is an absurd formulation that implies art is something which *a priori* stands outside of society, and that it is necessary to introduce the little copula 'and' in order to bring them together. This is a relic of the era of sociological aesthetics, when empirical sociology was still taking its first faltering steps, and had hardly devised its own problems, methods and concepts.

The more contemporary problematics of 'art *in* society' have guided some magnificent works on the social history of art, in essence, since the 1960s. I am thinking here of Frederick Antal on patronage, for example, or Nikolaus Pevsner on academies, Martin Warnke and Bram Kempers on the disappearance of the artisan status of the painter, or Harrison and Cynthia White on the genesis of the modern art market in the nineteenth century.[17] Other examples would include the Italians Carlo Ginzburg or

---

[16] For an outline of the main trends, see Nathalie Heinich, *La Fabrique du patrimoine. De la cathédrale à la petite cuillère* (Paris, 2009).

[17] Frederick Antal, *Florentine Painting and its Social Background: the Bourgeois Republic before Cosimo de'Medici's Advent to Power: Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Centuries* (London, 1948); Nikolaus Pevsner, *Academies of Art. Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940); Bram Kempers, *Painting, Power and Patronage. The Rise of the Professional Artist in the Italian Renaissance* (Harmondsworth, 1992); Martin Warnke, *The Court Artist. On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist*, 1985, trans. David McLintock (Cambridge, 1993); Harrison and Cynthia White, *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World* (Chicago, IL, 1965).

Enrico Castelnuovo on the cultural environment of the products of the Italian Renaissance, Michael Baxandall on the 'symbolic forms' framing the production and reception of artworks, Albert Boime on the French academic system in the nineteenth century, Francis Haskell on the history of patronage, Thomas Crow on the art publics in eighteenth-century France, Andrew Martindale on the progress of the modern figure of the artist at the end of the Middle Ages, or Millard Meiss on the role of the Black Death in Florentine pictorial production.[18] Finally one might mention John Montias on the socio-economic status of Flemish image makers in the seventeenth century.[19] All of these works have concentrated on the social conditions of the production of artworks in the past. Is this the royal road of the sociology of art: to undertake in relation to the present what the social history of art has accomplished with regard to the past?

I do not think so. First of all, because sociology should not be precluded from drawing on the past; the work of Norbert Elias is enough to demonstrate the validity and the interest from extending it in this way.[20] Additionally, because in many cases research on the social conditions of artworks still remains too close to an implicit valorization of them, even if most immediately they are thought of as belonging to society (art *in* society) and no longer as distinct from it (art *and* society). It seems to me that a more productive perspective is to treat the different elements of art *like* a society, that is to say, as composed of interactions, institutions, representations and evaluations that can be observed, described, even quantified. The ensemble of elements that intervene in the production, the dissemination and the reception of objects that are counted as artistic thus becomes just as worthy of analysis as the objects themselves.

---

[18] See Carlo Ginzburg, *The Enigma of Piero: Piero della Francesca*, trans. Martin Ryle and Kate Soper (London, 2002); Enrico Castelnuovo, 'L'histoire sociale de l'art: un bilan provisoire', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 6 (1976) 63–75; Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-century Italy. A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style* (Oxford, 1972); Albert Boime, *The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1971); Francis Haskell, *Patrons and Painters: Study in the Relations between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque* (London, 1963); Thomas Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-century Paris* (Cambridge, 1985); Andrew Martindale, *The Rise of the Artist in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance* (London, 1972); Millard Meiss, *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death* (Princeton, NJ, 1951).

[19] John Michael Montias, *Artists and Artisans in Delft. A Socio-economic Study of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton, NJ, 1982).

[20] See Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, trans. Edmund Jephcott, ed. Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell (Oxford, rev. edn., 2000).

In order to do this, however, it is necessary to come to terms with talking about methods, even though this is considerably less distinguished than writing about the social meaning of artworks. Above all this is because a discipline is not defined by its objects, its concepts or its problems, but by its methods.[21] And the proper method of sociology, sociology as a research discipline in its own right, and no longer a modernized successor to an aesthetics in need of renewal, is inquiry. It does not matter greatly whether it is quantitative or qualitative, consisting of observation or questionnaires, the production or analysis of empirical data, large-scale studies or micro-analyses; the sociology of art, as properly defined, was born with the beginning of the investigation of the institutions, the publics and the professions of the art world. In France it initially began some forty years ago, due notably to the work of Pierre Bourdieu and Raymonde Moulin, as well as to studies by the Ministry of Culture which achieved much for the development of such work and the formation of a new generation of sociologists.[22]

Empiricism and Theory

The problem is that sociology in general, and the sociology of art in particular, is still divided between the poles of the humanities, which privilege theoretical approaches, and of the social sciences, which privilege empirical enquiry. On the one hand one would expect grand syntheses on 'art' and its place in 'society', along the lines of a model privileged by the German tradition from Theodor W. Adorno to Niklas Luhmann today.[23] On the other hand, one might expect investigations within the terrain of approved methods, whether qualitative or quantitative, that are in keeping with a model privileged both by American sociology (but not by cultural studies) and a certain tradition in France.[24] Thus, in the world of the

---

[21] See Nathalie Heinich, 'Objets, problématiques, terrains, méthodes: pour un pluralisme méthodique', *Sociologie de l'art-Opus* 9–10 (2006) 15–27.

[22] See Pierre Bourdieu, Alain Darbel, and Dominique Schnapper, *The Love of Art. European Art Museums and their Public* (Cambridge, 1997); Raymonde Moulin, *Le Marché de la peinture en France* (Paris, 1967).

[23] See Janet Wolff, *The Social Production of Art* (London, 1981); Vera Zolberg, *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts* (Cambridge, 1990); Matthew Rampley, 'L'Art considéré comme système social. Observations sur la sociologie de l'art de Niklas Luhmann', *Sociologie de l'art-Opus* 7 (2005) 159–85.

[24] See, for example, Howard S. Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley, CA, 1982); Eliot Freidson, 'Les professions artistiques comme défi à l'analyse sociologique', *Revue française de*

contemporary French university the term 'sociology of art' is mostly asso-
ciated with empirical enquiries into the reception of art (cultural prac-
tices, aesthetic perception, taste, kinds of evaluation, collecting practices),
into its production (the social, economic and legal status of its creators,
artistic careers, the role of age, sex, education and social origins on one's
relation to creativity, collective representations of artists) or indeed into
how it is mediated (circles of recognition, the role of intermediaries such
as editors, agents, gallery owners, exhibition curators and critics).

It appears that in the Anglo-Saxon world the practice of publishing
Readers, which is much more developed than in France, tends to blur
this opposition between abstract theory and empirical enquiry by mix-
ing the two in the same volume.[25] Such freedom certainly has the advan-
tage of making it possible to view together research that is dispersed
across different journals or in specialized publications. However it has
the disadvantage of sometimes obscuring the specific nature and coher-
ence of works that attempt to construct a coherent vision and concept
of the phenomena linked to art—which can sometimes be transferred to
other domains—by proceeding inductively, starting with fieldwork that is
guided by controlled methods of investigation. It would seem that this is
the main asset of the French sociology of art that has developed with the
most recent generation.

The Concepts of French Sociology of Art

By thus becoming fully sociological, the sociology of art has expanded in
several directions. First of all it has expanded the objects of research; pro-
cesses of reception, mediating agents, the professional status of producers,
individual and institutions, budgets and discourses, texts and images all
become as interesting to study as objects given up to contemplation by

---

sociologie XXVII.3 (1986) 431–44; Paul DiMaggio, *Managers of the Arts* (Cabin John, MD,
1986); DiMaggio, 'Classification in Art', *American Sociological Review* 52 (1987) 440–55;
Diana Crane, *The Transformation of the Avant-garde. The New York Art World, 1940–1985*
(Chicago, 1987); Gladys Engel Lang and Kurt Lang, 'Recognition and Renown: The Sur-
vival of Artistic Reputation', *American Journal of Sociology* 94.1 (1988) 79–109; Vera Zolberg
and Joni Cherbo, eds., *Outsider Art: Contesting Boundaries in Contemporary Culture* (Cam-
bridge, 1997).
    [25] See Arnold W. Foster and Judith R. Blau, *Art and Society. Readings in the Sociology
of the Arts* (New York, 1989); Jeremy Tanner, ed., *The Sociology of Art. A Reader* (London,
2003); David Inglis and John Hughson, eds., *The Sociology of Art. Ways of Seeing* (London,
2005).

art lovers, or to analysis, attribution or commentary by art historians. In addition, it has widened, one might say, its focus. The sociologist of art no longer reflects on isolated objects (a painting or a group of paintings, an artist) but on problems: the evolution of aesthetic perception, the steps in the status of the artist, or the role of institutions, for example. Furthermore it is here, in the difference in the level of generalization, that one of the principal misunderstandings between art historians and sociologists of art is to be found. The latter generally work with large-scale bodies of material that are already well known, whereas historians in France tend to gauge research quality in terms of how unrecorded its object, even if it is of minor significance.

In addition to extending the objects of inquiry and its analytical focus, the sociology of art, as currently practiced professionally, has broadened out in a third way: it has been enriched with concepts borrowed from sociology proper, which have allowed it to take a new look at certain issues that art history was unable to ignore, but which it had not been able to address with tools that were not specialized. Here are some examples.

Let us begin with the concepts elaborated by the figure who, despite the numerous criticisms prompted by his approach, remains the founder of a sociology of art that is, fundamentally, empirical while having at the same time a theoretical vision: Pierre Bourdieu.[26] Where art historians think in terms of 'context', sociologists speak of 'field', which affords them a much more dynamic, structured and hierarchical vision. The concept of 'field' is inseparable from that of 'autonomy', or rather, 'autonomization' which, provided it is used purely as a descriptive term, makes it possible to take account of the distance of a given activity from ordinary life, and to put some perspective on the extent of the real relations between its elements depending on whether or not they belong to the same 'field'. Thus there can be no 'influence' (a classic term in art history) unless there is some proximity within the field; there can be no 'determination' (a classic term of materialist or Marxist art history) unless one assumes that the determining factor has some exteriority to what it determines, and a possible action of the one on the other (these two hypotheses are, at the least, daring and cannot easily be demonstrated).[27] A third concept that Bourdieu valued highly, and which he borrowed from Max Weber,

---

[26] See Nathalie Heinich, *Pourquoi Bourdieu?*
[27] On the notion of autonomy in the field in the sociology of art see Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*.

although he gave it a critical overtone, is that of 'legitimation'. In spite of its ambiguities it had the benefit of introducing a theory of power and of forms of domination that one would search for in vain in the commonly used metaphoric talk of the 'ennobling' of an activity.[28]

When art historians are asked about the status of creators, many tend to think only in terms of economic status; how much do painters earn, who are their clients or their patrons? One need only come back to socio-logical work on the professions to realize that the concept of 'profession-alization'—which can be applied as much to the decline of amateurism as to the shift from artisan trade to liberal profession—is a precious tool that can give meaning to the whole movement of academicism and to the long gap that separated a few great charismatic Renaissance artists from their Romantic heirs.[29]

A further example: when art historians concentrate on individual biog-raphies, to the great profit of sociologists, who draw much of their mate-rial from them, the latter are more interested in the different modalities of artistic 'identity', the points of reference, types of representations, defini-tions of excellence, and ways in which artists perceive themselves, present themselves to others, and are designated by others.[30]

Finally, a last example. When art historians ascertain the 'critical fate' of an artist by reviewing commentaries prompted by his or her work, the sociologist will be interested more in the process of 'recognition'.[31] This will oblige them to take into the spatial dimension of recognition as well as its temporal dimension, by differentiating between the categories capable of bestowing it (peers, specialists, collectors, or the wider public, who do not confer recognition of the same kind or of the same quality).[32] They will also need to distinguish between the different places it is applied (between the greatness of the oeuvre and that of their personality, the variations are of remarkable significance, as the case of Van Gogh illustrates).[33]

---

[28] On the application of the idea of legitimation to the question of cultural practice see Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste,* trans. Richard Nice (Oxford, 1986).

[29] See Nathalie Heinich, *Du peintre à l'artiste. Artisans et académiciens à l'âge classique* (Paris, 1993).

[30] See Heinich, *L'Élite artiste.*

[31] See Axel Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition. The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts* (Cambridge, 1995).

[32] See Alan Bowness, *The Conditions of Success. How the Modern Artist Rises to Fame* (London, 1989).

[33] See Nathalie Heinich, *The Glory of Van Gogh. An Anthropology of Admiration, 1991* (Princeton, NJ, 1996).

These are just some examples of concepts borrowed from general sociology and which are of great use to the sociology of art. One can add others, which would indicate the directions open to sociologists of art today. For example, the sociology of groups of artists, on which almost everything remains to be done; the sociology of values, with the values of singularity and authenticity, which are seminal in the art world, but which have hardly been studied by the sociological tradition; the question of 'artification', in other words, the process whereby an activity becomes art; [34] the 'transfer of sacrality' from the religious domain to that of art, on which anthropologists and sociologists of art could work together.

With this we are far removed from the theme of 'art and society. We can certainly take up anew some familiar investigations from art history, which has provided the sociologist with very rich material. In order to avoid losing ourselves in it, we have to accept the need to privilege the task of making clear the problematics of the hidden nature of the documentation, which sometimes makes a dialogue between our two disciplines difficult. Caught between their fellow sociologists, who tend to be intimidated by the object of 'art', and art historians, who rarely have any interest in sociology, or limit their interest to studies of museum visitors, sociologists of art sometimes tend to feel a little isolated. This article will hopefully allow us to make progress on the path towards rapprochement.[35]

---

[34] See Nathalie Heinich and Roberta Shapiro, eds., *De l'artification. Enquêtes sur le passage à l'art* (Paris, forthcoming).

[35] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference 'L'Histoire de l'art en questions' (Bibliothèque de l'Alcazar, Marseille, 2005), and published in Jean-Noël Bret, Michel Guérin, Marc Jimenez, eds., *Penser l'art. Histoire de l'art et esthétique* (Paris, 2009).

MUSEUMS AND MUSEOLOGIES

Dominique Poulot

Translated by Matthew Rampley

Historical Preliminaries and Contemporary Definitions

The character of the European museum does not stem merely from the principle of being a collection open to visitors. It is also tied to the emergence of a type of public space towards the end of the eighteenth century, in other words, to the ideal of discussion around a common interest, of which the museum was both a pedagogical and patriotic instrument.[1] In the nineteenth century the museum contributed to the elaboration of an international culture of exhibiting that had clear links not only to the World's Fairs, but also to department stores, panoramas and the most diverse apparatus of display that the social theorist Tony Bennett has termed the 'exhibitory complex'.[2] During the course of the twentieth century the museum was increasingly shaped in response to the idea of the 'white cube'.[3] The new video installations came then with the idea of a 'black box'. In all these configurations the museum, as Svetlana Alpers has emphasized, constituted a specific mode of seeing.[4]

The contemporary definition of the museum might be seen largely in accordance with the formulation provided by ICOM, according to which 'a museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study

---

[1] See Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (1962), trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge, MA, 1991).

[2] Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London, 1995).

[3] Brian O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (Los Angeles, 1986; exp. edn 1999).

[4] Svetlana Alpers, 'The Museum as a Way of Seeing', in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, ed. Ivan Karp and Steve Lavine (Washington DC, 1991) 25–32.

and enjoyment'.[5] The goal of the museum is thus to 'facilitate the preser-
vation, continuation and management of tangible or intangible heritage
resources (living heritage and digital creative activity)'.[6]

Throughout Europe ministries of culture, or equivalent administrations,
have in general attempted to stipulate the minimal conditions underpin-
ning the claim to museum status, and hence to claim eligibility for public
funding and other sources of assistance, in keeping with the legal frame-
work governing profit-making enterprises in culture and leisure. For the
British Museums Association 'Museums enable people to explore collec-
tions for inspiration, learning and enjoyment. They are institutions that
collect, safeguard and make accessible artefacts and specimens, which
they hold in trust for society'.[7] In France the Law of 4 January 2002 defined
a 'Musée de France', a designation that provides entitlement to a num-
ber of benefits and privileges, as 'any permanent collection comprised of
holdings, the conservation and presentation of which is a matter of public
interest, and which is organized with a view to public knowledge, educa-
tion and enjoyment'.[8]

As such the museum is currently a central institution in the European
art world. Its spectacular growth in the final third of the twentieth century
is the fruit of considerable public and private investment, which has made
possible both the growth of new sources of income, the reconfiguration of
old collections and the creation, extension or refurbishment of the build-
ings housing them. The development of these permanent structures of
collecting and exhibiting has been accompanied by the multiplication of
temporary exhibitions, in other words, the so-called 'ephemeral museums',
which Francis Haskell so deplored.[9] This combination of changes has put
the public into the centre of the interests of the institution, which has
devoted a whole series of new services to it, and they have also brought
about in their wake a transformation in the professional practice of cura-
tors and mediators. The desire to establish co-operation between public

---

[5] International Council of Museums, ICOM Statutes (Barcelona, 2001), Article II. Avail-
able online at: http://icom.museum/definition.html (accessed: 30 May 2010). The basic
definition was first formulated in the Statutes of 1974.
[6] ICOM Statutes, Article II.
[7] Museums Association, *Code of Ethics for Museums* (London, 2008) 8. Available online
at: http://www.museumsassociation.org/download?id=15717 (accessed 30 May 2010).
[8] French Ministry of Culture, 'Loi 2002–5 du 4 janvier 2002 modifiée relative aux musées
de France', (Paris, 2002) Article I. Available online at: http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/
infos-pratiques/droit-culture/musees/pdf/2002-5.pdf (accessed 30 May 2010).
[9] Francis Haskell, *The Ephemeral Museum: Old Master Paintings and the Rise of the Mod-
ern Art Exhibition* (London and New Haven, CT, 2000).

and private actors, the state and organizations responsible for museums, as well as artists, cultural communities or foundations has, whilst respecting the specificities of their commitments, been tied into ethical considerations, which have been expressed in the proliferation of different *ad hoc* codes in virtually every country in recent years.

History of Museums

During the early modern period (from the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries) the idea of acquiring a corpus of masterpieces, by purchase, conquest or reproduction, focused on ancient sculpture most of all. 'We must make sure that France has all that is most beautiful in Italy' stated Colbert in 1669 to Charles Errard (1606–1689), director of the French Academy in Rome.[10] Equally, the exploitation of the distance of places by dealers in curios fed an aesthetic founded on the decontextualization of rare and exotic objects. The ideal of research, conceived of as a collective effort by the republic of *savants*, led to the development of collections in the academies, universities and hospitals. The *galleria progressiva* was the first model for this, and was exemplified by the museum of Verona, built during the decade of 1736 to 1746 on the initiative of the marquis Scipione Maffei (1675–1755), a leading light of the European republic of antiquaries, its programme being 'either for history of all kinds, for art or for languages'.[11] Inscriptions were exhibited there in a progressive series, from prehistory to the Middle Ages, covering the different languages of the Mediterranean basin. The origin of the idea is connected to the Franciscan Carlo Lodoli (1690–1761), who between 1730 and 1750 built up a collection in Venice that displayed 'step by step the progression of the art of drawing'.[12] This concept inspired in its turn a number of connoisseurs across Europe.[13]

---

[10] Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500–1900* (London and New Haven, CT, 1981) 37–42, here: 37.

[11] Lanfranco Franzoni, 'Il Museo Maffeiano secondo l'ordinamento di Scipione Maffei', in *Nuovi studi Maffeiani: atti del Convegno Scipione Maffei e il Museo maffeiano: Verona 18–19 novembre 1983, Ridotto dell'Accademia filarmonica* (Verona, 1985) 207–32.

[12] Carlo Lodoli, *Elementi dell' architettura lodoliana, o sia, L'arte del fabbricare con solidità scientifica e con eleganza* (Rome, 1786). See Joseph Rykwert, *The First Moderns: Architects of the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1980) 336.

[13] For more examples see Adalgisa Lugli, 'Inquiry as Collection: The Athanasius Kircher Museum in Rome', *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 12 (1986) 109–24; Valentin Kockel, Brigitte Sölch, Martin Heise and Eva-Maria Landwehr, eds., *Francesco Bianchini (1662–1729) und die europäische gelehrte Welt um 1700* (Berlin, 2005).

In Germany the young state of Saxony was anxious to make its mark on the European stage, and its demands were fulfilled by the encyclopaedic museum described in 1752 by Count Algarotti.[14] It signalled the first attempt at a scholarly approach that was characteristic of museums in the Enlightenment.[15] The building that was envisaged, a square structure with central courtyard, was separate from the palace of the prince; with its overhead lighting it evoked the other major model of the museum, the Tribuna of the Uffizi, or Rubens's Rotunda for his collection in Antwerp. In the Picture Gallery in Dresden, the illustrated catalogue of 1753, which introduced the collections with a plan by Carl Heinrich von Heinecken, general director of the art collections and academies of Saxony, indicated a division into schools (Italian, Flemish, French, German).[16] The demand for this classification by period and country gradually became dominant. In Vienna in 1783 the scholar, engraver and publisher Christian de Mechel (1737–1817), originally from Basel, having been employed to reorganize the Austrian Emperor Josef II's collections in the Belvedere Palace, drew up the plan of a museum 'in chronological order following the succession of great masters', which 'organized paintings by school' and brought together 'the works of one master in the same room', providing for the first time 'a warehouse of the visible history of art'.[17]

The masterpiece of eighteenth-century museography, however, remains the elaboration of the Museo Pio-Clementino in Rome which was started in 1771 at the initiative of Count Gianangelo Braschi (1717–1799), the treasurer of Pope Clement XIV. Once Braschi became Pope Pius VI in 1775, this establishment, which was initially restricted to a few rooms, witnessed a spectacular growth, acquiring numerous artworks that were the result of excavations. The rooms, in the form of a Greek cross, and the Rotunda, the work of Michelangelo Simonetti (1724–1781), laid claim to archaeological

---

[14] Bénédicte Savoy, ed., *Tempel der Kunst: Die Entstehung des öffentlichen Museums in Deutschland 1701–1815* (Mainz, 2006).

[15] See Francis Haskell, *History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past* (London and New Haven, CT, 1993).

[16] On the early history of the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden see Gregor J.M. Weber, 'Die Galerie als Kunstwerk: Die Hängung italienischer Gemälde in der Dresdner Galerie 1754', in *Elbflorenz: Italienische Präsenz in Dresden 16.–19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Barbara Marx (Amsterdam, 2000) 229–42; Tristan Weddigen, 'Ein Modell für die Geschichte der Kunst: Die Hängungen der Dresdener Gemäldegalerie zwischen 1747 und 1856', *Dresdener Kunstblätter* 53.1 (2009) 44–58.

[17] Christian von Mechel, *Verzeichniß der Gemälde der Kaiserlich Königlichen Bilder-Galerie in Wien* (Vienna, 1780). On Mechel see Debora Meijers, *Kunst als Natur. Die Habsburger Gemäldegalerie in Wien um 1780* (Vienna and Milan, 1995).

fidelity, so that they might all the better valorize the collection and the Church, the legitimate heir to ancient Rome; they were the first example of organization by period room.[18] Yet the opening hours and conditions for visiting the galleries were often highly restrictive.[19] Even the British Museum, set up by Parliament in 1753 with the express aim of public access, was difficult in that regard, with visitors taken through at a quick pace, allowing little time for contemplation.[20] The real users of the museums were the *studiosi* and artists, who always benefitted from privileged visiting conditions.

Although a new museum had developed at the end of the eighteenth century, according to an ideal of public utility, following a set of models, and governed by the imperative of efficacy, it was only in revolutionary France that it became the symbol of the nation, this new 'imagined community'.[21] England, Germany and France provided the model museums, due to the importance of their resources, the founding of new establishments and the quality of organization. In 1803 the architect and theorist Jean-Nicolas-Louis Durand, whose influence on architects of European museums would be extensive during the first half of the nineteenth century, defined the museum as 'on the one hand a public treasury, a most precious warehouse of human knowledge, on the other, a temple devoted to study'.

In England Robert Smirke's British Museum, begun in 1823, was set in an Ionic peristyle; it inaugurated a tradition of building in the style of a Greek temple that was adopted again for the National Gallery in London (William Wilkins, 1832) or the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge by George Basevi (1837–1848). It was only in the middle of the century that Gothic provided an alternative, first in the Oxford University Museum of Natural History of Benjamin Woodward (1855–1860), as a manifesto of iron construction for prestigious purposes. Likewise the Great Exhibition of 1851 in Hyde Park led the way to the founding of the South Kensington Museum, later the Victoria and Albert, which became an exemplar

---

[18] Gian Paolo Consoli, *Il Museo Pio-Clementino: La scena dell'antico in Vaticano* (Modena, 1996).

[19] Paolo Liverani, 'The Museo Pio-Clementino at the time of the Grand Tour', *Journal of the History of Collections* 12.2 (2000) 151–9.

[20] Robert G. Williams Anderson, Marjorie L. Caygill, Arthur G. MacGregor, and Luke Syson, eds., *Enlightening the British: Knowledge, Discovery and the Museum in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 2004).

[21] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1983) (London, rev. edn., 2006).

for posterity.[22] In order to provide accessible models—indispensable for British design—Henry Cole, who was entrusted with the direction of the museum and its associated art schools from 1853 to 1873, resorted to the use of reproductions—photography, and above all plaster casts of sculptures—indicating his pedagogic pragmatism. However the museum rapidly developed into a worldwide collection: it included Asia and the Islamic world, which illustrated the hierarchy of cultures and their relation to the British Empire.

Other temporary exhibitions turned into permanent institutions. The National Portrait Gallery was founded in 1858 by Lord Stanhope who, following the success of two exhibitions of historical portraits in South Kensington, decided to bring together the collections of royal portraits, and portraits of great men of state, of men of letters and artists. The expansion of museums across the country was linked to two laws, the Museums of Act of 1845, and the Museums and Libraries Act of 1850, the reasons for which were either quite prosaic (the development of manufacturing) or social (the moral education of the masses). Reformers 'began to advocate art as a potentially active and democratic force for making nature, beauty, and the morality of expressive labour available in the industrial city'.[23] Indeed, a notable feature of English museography was eventually the rise of museums specifically for the wider population, the 'philanthropic galleries' (G. Waterfield) that were set up in the most disadvantaged areas of the metropolis, such as the Whitechapel Gallery, opened in East London in 1901, and which made use of reproductions, ranging from engravings to photographs, plaster casts or facsimiles.[24]

It was above all in Berlin, however, that the numbers of archetypal museums grew during the century; the first, the 'Altes Museum', as it was later called, was designed and developed by Karl Friedrich Schinkel during the 1820s.[25] The concept was linked to the precepts of Idealism, whereby art provided the transcendence that had previously been in the domain of religion. This sanctuary imposed on the visitor the conception of the museum that was in keeping with the Greek ideal of *paideia*. It was inscribed within the wider educational policy and the sponsorship of the

---

[22] Jeffrey A. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display* (New Haven, CT, 1999).

[23] Amy Woodson-Boulton, ' "Industry without Art Is Brutality:" Aesthetic Ideology and Social Practice in Victorian Art Museums', *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007) 47–71.

[24] Giles Waterfield, ed., *Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain 1790–1990* (London, 1991).

[25] James J. Sheehan, *Museums in the German Art World: From the End of the Old Regime to the Rise of Modernism* (New York, 2000).

arts in the service of the construction of the Prussian state. Wilhelm von Humboldt, founder of the University of Berlin in 1810, was associated with this project, which contributed to reflection on *Bildung*, understood as a process of education in which aesthetic experience played a significant part. Opened in 1830, the museum took on the appearance of a classical temple. The rotunda was a museum within the museum, based on the model of the Pantheon in Rome, although its dimensions were half those of the latter.

Faced with the growing size of the collections, the architect Friedrich August Stüler (1800–1865) was commissioned in 1843 with building a 'Neues Museum' that was intended to house works of classical archaeology, ethnography and antiquities of the nation. Opened in 1859, the museum was the signal for a programme of uninterrupted building that gradually shaped the landscape of the Museum Island (Museumsinsel). Hence, in 1876, Stüler built a further museum dedicated to contemporary art, although in the following year the decorative arts and ethnography were exiled from the Museum Island, which *de facto* came to be dedicated to artworks and archaeological monuments.

Wilhelm von Bode (1845–1929), who entered the museum in 1872, became the archetypal museum director of the second half of the nineteenth century. Responsible for the collections of the Prussian state from 1897–1920, he oversaw an expansion in the publication of catalogues and scholarly studies, including the annual journal, the *Preussisches Jahrbuch*, which made visible the high quality and productivity of German *Kunstwissenschaft*. The Kaiser Friedrich-Museum (which later became the Bode-Museum), built by the architect Ernst von Ihne (1848–1917) between 1897 and 1903 in the German neo-baroque style, displayed the medieval and Renaissance collections chronologically, and attempted to contextualize them. Its masterpiece was the 'Kirchenraum' ('the ecclesiastical room') which was decorated with architectural elements. In 1907 Bode envisaged a museum forum; in the centre of the Museum Island the Museum of the Pergamon Altar, to the right, the Near East (the 'Vorderasiatisches Museum'), and to the left, German art (the 'Deutsches Museum'). With the completion of the Pergamon-Museum in 1930, the year of its hundredth anniversary, the Museum Island represented the most exemplary expression of the encyclopaedic museology of the nineteenth century.[26]

---

[26] Thomas W. Gaehtgens, *Die Berliner Museumsinsel im Deutschen Kaiserreich: Zur Kulturpolitik der Museen in der wilhelminischen Epoche* (Munich, 1992). For a good bibliography see Katharina Krings, *Die Berliner Museumsinsel: Museale Präsentation im*

The construction of such large-scale museums was often prompted by the redesign of city centres, and this was a forerunner of the museum and cultural quarters of the twenty-first century.[27] Vienna undoubtedly provides the best example of this remodelling of the capital city in the nineteenth century, when, following the demolition of the old city ramparts, Gottfried Semper (1870–1891) designed two symmetrical museums, the Kunsthistorisches Museum and the Naturhistorisches Museum. Between the two museums, in the centre of the square, stood the statue of the Empress Maria Theresia: her 'caring, motherly figure contrasts strongly with the two military heroes whom Francis Joseph had chosen in the 1850's as focal statues of the Heldenplatz across the Ring. Nor does she resemble the figure whom the liberals chose to place before their parliament: Pallas Athena.'[28]

The art museum in pre-revolutionary France was shaped by the desire for a display that would serve as a point of reference, making available for contemporary art production canonical examples from the past, preserved in the royal collection. The gallery opened in the Palais du Luxembourg was a response for this demand for sources of emulation, and in its organization, pedagogical priorities and aesthetic criteria it was inspired by the literature and practices of the Academy. On the eve of 1789 the project of setting up, in what would later become the Louvre, statues of great men and masterpieces from the royal collection that were the result of the patronage of the monarch, evoked the idea of a French 'Westminster', where the cult of pre-eminent servants of the nation would consolidate the image of the sovereign for posterity, displaying 'all art objects . . . in such a way that each object will be put on view in the most advantageous way possible, and preserved in the best possible state'.[29] But its aim was above all one of political, aesthetic and patriotic instruction, as the painter David insisted in the Year II (1793):

> The museum is no longer a vain collection of luxury or frivolous objects that only serve to satisfy the needs of curiosity. It must become an important

historischen Wandel (Norderstedt, 2007); Alexis Joachimides, *Die Museumsreformbewegung in Deutschland und die Entstehung des modernen Museums 1880–1940* (Dresden, 2001).

[27] Simon Roodhouse, *Cultural Quarters: Principles and Practice* (Bristol, 2006).

[28] Carl E. Schorske, 'Museum in Contested Space: The Sword, the Scepter and the Ring', *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 88 (1992), 11–20 (here 19).

[29] Dominique Poulot, *Une histoire des musées de France, XVIIIème–XXème siècles* (Paris, 2005).

school. School teachers should bring their young students; the father should bring his son.[30]

At the same time, the museum also became a pantheon of living artists, as was made clear in the project of a contemporary museum, proposed by Toussaint-Bernard Éméric-David under the *Directoire* (the executive power of the first French Republic) in 1796.[31] Inclusion in the Olympic Museum of the Living School of Fine Art ('Musée olympique de l'école vivante des beaux-arts') would be a distinction, a reward given on the basis of merit. As Éméric-David stated, 'it should be the case that impatience to be included in the Museum, and the fear of seeing one's glory fading there, are a source of constant torment'. With his Olympic Museum, which was given the task of gathering the best contemporary works as a means of provoking emulation by others, Éméric-David sought to establish the principle of a new articulation between the salon and the museum: 'This establishment', he wrote, 'is a complement to the main institutions required for public instruction. If it is conjoined with those we already have, all aspects will be addressed: the schools and the salon, where all artists exhibit their work.' The subsequent inauguration of the Musée du Luxembourg on 24 April 1818 provided the opportunity to state that in this new establishment 'everything is national, everything is modern'.[32]

During the nineteenth century the museum became a cog within the machinery of the fine arts, serving the wealth of the public sphere and the taste of the nation, but also helping to cement the régime by the distribution of artworks to the regions. Eventually the creation of the Union of National Museums ('Réunion des musées nationaux') by the Finance Bill of 16 April 1895, following extended debates, gave the national museums a certain degree of independence. If they contributed directly to the training of artists and artisans, the museums also had to participate in the education of the gaze of all citizens.[33] In 1905 the Dujardin-Beaumetz Commission on the 'Organization of Museums in the Regions' recognized that the expanding numbers of courses in drawing were increasingly 'the

[30] Dominique Poulot, *Musée, nation, patrimoine (1789–1815)* (Paris, 1997) 208.

[31] Toussaint-Bernard Éméric-David, *Musée Olympique de Lécole vivante des beaux arts: ou considérations sur la nécessité de cet établissement, et sur les moyens de le rendre aussi utile qu'il peut l'être* (Paris, 1796).

[32] Jesús Pedro Lorente, *Cathedrals of Urban Modernity: The First Museums of Contemporary Art, 1800–1930* (Aldershot, 1999).

[33] Brigitte Schroeder-Gudehus, ed., *La société industrielle et ses musées: Demande sociale et choix politiques, 1890–1990* (Paris, 1992).

grounds for . . . the creation of new museums or for the display of existing collections in a more approachable manner'. In this sense the place of museums in the wider system of public instruction attests to the close alliance between museum and school in Republican representation.

Sociology of Museums

This chapter is not going to attempt to provide a sociology of museum publics, although it should be recalled that in virtually every European country approximately one third of the population visits museums frequently, a further third visits them rarely, and another third never visits them. The increasing drive to study museum attendance, undertaken by the institutions themselves, has led either to a rounding out or to a correcting of the views of Pierre Bourdieu, who conducted the first analysis of museum visitors in Europe in the mid-1960s.[34] It has led to a qualification of the proclamations of democratization that are generally made in the official political and administrative literature of each country, but it also involves adding nuances to the claims that museums are restricted to a bourgeois elite. The circumstances of the museum visit—generally in groups and not by isolated individuals—the multiple sexual, social and professional identities of visitors, as well as the personal expectations of what will be gained from the visiting experience, are now on the research agenda of the social sciences.[35]

The sociological approach to institutions has, particularly in the countries of Northern Europe and the United Kingdom, fed the political aim of making museums into an important and effective agent of social regeneration, or into an instrument of multicultural politics, in harmony with the communities it represents. In Great Britain, following the relative triumph in the 1960s and 1970s of history 'from below', institutions became preoccupied in the 1980s and 1990s with issues of pedagogy, which involved greater alignment with the demands of school curricula.[36] There has been an abundance of publicity on the theme of the museum as an agent of

---

[34] Pierre Bourdieu, Alain Darbel, and Dominique Schnapper, *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public*, trans. Caroline Beattie and Nick Merriman (Cambridge, 1997).

[35] Dominique Poulot, 'Quelle place pour la "question du public" dans le domaine des musées?' in Olivier Donnat and Paul Tolilla, eds., *Le(s) public(s) de la culture* (Paris, 2003) 103–23.

[36] Richard Sandell, ed., *Museums, Society, Inequality* (Leicester, 2002).

'social inclusion', while this theme has been pursued rather more timidly both in France and more widely across southern Europe.

Museums have nevertheless been as much involved in research and teaching as they have in tourist consumption and the leisure economy.[37] The flexibility the museum has demonstrated over the last decades has provided material for it to reflect on its *own* memory, its ambivalences and paradoxes, as much as on history in general. It also has enabled it to bear witness to immaterial heritage as much as to cultivate the study of material culture, beyond the history of art *stricto sensu*. In all these contexts the museum has benefitted from being able to maintain, or even enhance, its intellectual authority in the academic field. This is contrary to what one might have thought a generation or two ago, when contemporary artists strove to escape the museum, in search of alternative exhibition and research spaces, or when art historians, seeking a new form for their discipline, rejected the lessons of the museum as being too conventional. For sure, the museum of today no longer enjoys the unquestioned and self-evident status that sustained the museums of the past; in terms of heritage it has to justify its policies, it has to identify its specific identity in terms of research, and define its role within the field of national and European culture. But even if everyone rejects the idea of the museum as a sterile conservatory of artworks, or an ivory tower of knowledge, its legitimacy is now hardly a matter of debate, although whether this is to be deplored or applauded remains to be seen.

Museologies

There is little doubt that museology is a recent construction, but the word itself has a much older lineage. The *Museographia* by the merchant Caspar Friedrich Einckel, published in 1727, provided reflections on the choice of the most suitable sites for housing collections, on the best means of conserving *naturalia* as well as *artificialia* and, finally, on their classification.[38] In the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, the art lover Claude-Henri Watelet (1718–1786) praised the painting galleries open to the public that 'serve as schools for the arts and the nation, where art lovers can take

---

[37] Denis Bayart and Pierre-Jean Benghozi, *Le tournant commercial des musées en France et à l'étranger* (Paris, 1993).

[38] Caspar Friedrich Einckel, *Museographia oder: Anleitung zum rechten Begriff und nützlicher Auslegung der Museorum, oder Raritäten-Kammern* (Leipzig and Breslau, 1727).

their notions, artists make practical observations, and the public receive some of their first accurate ideas'.[39] In this statement there is the evocation of a museography yet to evolve, governed by the twofold idea of enjoyment and utility.

Beyond the concerns of the art lover facing the problem of how to organize the gallery, or of the naturalist preoccupied with issues of conservation and taxonomy, the disciplines of archaeology and then art history put into place the first and decisive classifications. First of all was the Danish archaeologist and museum curator Christian Jürgensen Thomson (1788–1865), who in 1836 devised the sequence of Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages.[40] This was expanded in John Lubbock's *Pre-historic Times*, published in 1865, which distinguished between the Palaeolithic, and the 'polished' Neolithic eras.[41] Eventually the emergence of a professional awareness led to the formation of associations of conservators; the Museums Association was set up in York in 1889. Subsequently each country established its own such association, which supported the exchange of ideas and models, although largely still at the level of individual experts and directors of institutions.

After the First World War the International Museums' Office ('Office international des musées'), created under the auspices of the League of Nations in 1926, provided a new and decisive framework for the first international co-operative enterprises. The study and comparison of national experiences, promised in the Office's journal, *Mouseion*, published between 1926 and 1940, led to the 1934 conference in Madrid, entitled *Museography. Architecture and Management of Art Museums*.[42] There Louis Hautecoeur, a curator of paintings at the Louvre, gave an important presentation to the architecture programme establishing an ideal mechanics of the exhibition; it represented the most up to date vision of museography of its time.[43]

---

[39] Claude-Henri Watelet and Pierre-Charles Levesque, *Dictionnaire des arts de peinture, sculpture et gravure* (Paris, 1792) I, Cabinet, 'Cabinets de Tableaux', 286.

[40] Christian Jürgensen Thomsen, *Ledetraad til Nordisk Oldkyndighed* (Copenhagen, 1836).

[41] John Lubbock, *Pre-historic Times, as Illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages* (London, 1865) 2 ff.

[42] Frederik Schmidt-Degener, Eric MacLagan, Francisco Javier Sanchez Canton, and Euripides Foundoukidis, eds., *Muséographie: Architecture et aménagement des musées d'art. Conférence internationale d'études, Madrid 1934* (Paris, 1935).

[43] Louis Hautecoeur, *Architecture et aménagement des musées* (Paris, 1993).

In the post-war period one can find a synthesis of opinions that had been developed earlier, although now in the light of the experience of totalitarian regimes and the war. An example is the work by Alma S. Wittlin (1899–1990), educated in Vienna before emigrating to England in 1937 and then to the United States in 1952, and whose *The Museum* of 1949 (and expanded in 1970) was a true masterpiece of museological and historical lucidity.[44] Against the inertia of European museums and the conservatism of their directors, she called for their educational mission to be taken seriously, and showed herself prophetic in her analysis of developments to come, as well as the *impasses* in the institution.

From the mid-1930s to the mid-1970s the specialist literature on museums was limited, and did not cross corporate boundaries. It reflected the total domination of history or art history, and was frequently produced by the museums themselves or the schools attached to them.[45] With the appearance of the 'New Museology' the museological territory opened up to encompass larger social, philosophical and political dimensions, which had until then been neglected. Thus, new studies of museums have addressed the analysis of the media, educational theory, sociology, political science, business studies or administrative theory. This configuration is broadly linked to different forms of international activism, such as that promoted by ICOFOM, the International Committee for Museology, founded in 1976.[46] The latter quickly came to occupy an important position in ICOM, becoming the principal site of museological discussion. Jan Jelínek, President of ICOM from 1972 to 1976, and also the founder of a department of museology at the University of Brno, was involved in its inception and his successor in 1989, Vinos Sofka, was himself educated in Brno. The aim was clearly to establish museology as a scientific discipline and, at the same time, to define the museum professions and the framework for research.[47] The disappearance of the counter-culture of the 1960s and the exhaustion of the critical theories of the 1970s, led, in France at least, to the crisis situation that institutional museography experienced at

---

[44] Alma S. Wittlin, *The Museum. Its History and its Tasks in Education* (London, 1949); Wittlin, *Museums: In Search of a Usable Future* (Cambridge, MA, 1970).

[45] Germain Bazin, *The Museum Age*, trans. Jane van Nuis Cahill (New York, 1967).

[46] See the website: http://www.icofom.com.ar/ (accessed 1 June 2010).

[47] Tomislav Šola, *Essays on Museums and their Theory: Toward the Cybernetic Museum* (Helsinki, 1997). See also the publications by Peter Van Mensch, Professor of Cultural Heritage at the Reinwardt Academie, who earned his PhD at the University of Zagreb on the basis of a thesis on the theory of museology: http://www.english.reinwardtacademie.nl/en/staff/lecturer-profiles/ (accessed 17 June 2010).

the turn of the twenty-first century.[48] An additional concern has gained prominence during the 1990s, namely, the inscription of the museum in the register of the memorial or the theatre of memory, as in the case of Daniel Libeskind's Jewish Museum in Berlin. Currently a number of museums have also engaged with the ruptures of recent history, one example being the museology of reconciliation in the former Yugoslavia.[49] The construction of such exhibitions casts a very particular light on museum strategies, and on the way they contribute to the stakes of memory, structuring contemporary public space with the *mise en scène* of historic criminality. Thus, alongside the representation of identities from a multi-cultural perspective, suffering, mourning, oblivion and commemoration have figured amongst the most recent and most complex concerns of museology.

Museum studies in the academic domain have, in contrast, multiplied at an unstoppable pace over the past twenty years, and can be put into two categories: 'Offensive museology applies a critical view to museums and their work. Defensive museology defends the necessity to uphold the strict methodology of a scholarly discourse in contrast to limited and opinionated professional interests.'[50] The second one bases itself, in the most interesting of its productions, on three disciplinary areas of research: the history of material culture, of public policy in cultural matters and the anthropology of issues related to heritage. In every museum one can see the traces or influence of other collections (earlier or contemporary), other *mises en scène*, and other acquisitions (private or public), which construct new ideologies of the object, and where the objects resonate in a different manner. Hence, the *memorabilia* and *personalia* linked to a single person or a group, 'familial objects', provide the stakes of collective memory, and contribute to a dialectic of emotional involvement and distance. The materiality of the museum becomes visible in a discipline concerned with display that functions as demonstration, proof or argument in the writing of history or in the vulgarization of its paradigms. Located at the heart of the bourgeois public sphere defined by Habermas as 'the sphere of private people come together as a public', and inasmuch as the latter were the audience, consumers and critics of art and literature,

---

[48] François Mairesse and André Desvallées, eds., *Vers une redéfinition du musée?* (Paris, 2007).
[49] Peter Davis, 'Places, "Cultural Touchstones" and the Ecomuseum', in *Heritage, Museums and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, ed. Gerard Corsane (London, 2005) 365–77.
[50] John Aage Gjestrum, 'Museology and Research: The Present Situation in a Norwegian Perspective', *Nordisk Museologi* 2 (1995) 5–22.

the museum produced a relation to specific objects as both a mundane experience and a tool of knowledge, and, equally, as a valued social activity.[51] For visiting a museum consisted of showing what Jean-Claude Passeron has called the 'will to pleasure' ('volonté de jouir') of art through the 'will to art' ('Kunstwollen') of Riegl.[52]

The notion of museum evaluation appeared in the 1920s, at the intersection of the concern with educating museum visitors, preoccupations within the professional milieu, and the ambitions of the social sciences. Procedures of evaluation in the strict sense only acquired recognition in the 1960s, in relation to 'scientific' psychology and the normative expectations of the time. From a critical perspective the analysis of museum visiting led the way to the denunciation of the illusion of an establishment that was open to all, when in fact it was restricted just to some, and perpetuated an *ancien régime* of 'institutionalized exclusion', to use the phrase of the English museologist Richard Sandell.[53] Faced with such readings, recent projects in pragmatic sociology by enthusiasts keen to 'repopulate' the diverse spaces of art have tried to demonstrate that a visit to the museum is a complex activity, neither completely a matter of leisure, nor one of pure learning, and that it involves different ways of enunciating and articulating in practical ways the interests whereby the amateurs gradually come to recognize what is of value for them.[54]

The European Museum and the World

After the Second World War museums in Europe defined themselves within the context of UNESCO, the worldwide network of cultural institutions. ICOM (International Council of Museums) first saw the light in November 1946 in Paris, thanks to the drive of the American Chauncey J. Hamlin, president of the Board of Trustees of the Science Museum of

---

[51] Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 27.

[52] 'Entretien avec Jean-Claude Passeron', *Tracés* 4 (December 2003) 127–44. Available online at: http://traces.revues.org/index3983.html (accessed 17 June 2010). See also Jean-Claude Passeron, 'La sociologie de la réception des œuvres dans ses rapports à la théorie de l'art et à la sémiologie de l'art', *Journées de l'EHESS, Montrouge-Marseille* (1987) 29–48.

[53] See Sandell, ed., *Museums, Society, Inequality*.

[54] See Antoine Hennion, 'Une sociologie des attachements: D'une sociologie de la culture à une pragmatique de l'amateur', available online at: http://halshs.archives-ouvertes .fr/halshs-00193149/fr/ (accessed 17 June 2010). English version: Emilie Gomart and Antoine Hennion, 'A Sociology of Attachment: Music Amateurs, Drug Users', *Sociological Review* 46.5, 220–47.

Buffalo, who had won over to his cause the director of the museums of France, Georges Salles, the latter becoming the second president of ICOM from 1956 to 1959. The working groups set up by UNESCO offer a real panorama of the world of museology at the time, comprising the arts, archaeology, history and historic sites, ethnography and folk art, science and technology, the natural sciences and, lastly, museums of childhood.

A quarterly journal, along the lines of *Mouseion*, the interwar journal, and titled *Museum*, with an additional ICOM news bulletin, together with publications by specialized international committees, or national associations, disseminated the deliberations of the Council. During the 1960s and 1970s ICOM sought to initiate new standards for the social usefulness of museums and heritage, mostly by hosting general conferences, by also publishing numerous documents on the part of its different committees. Its first leading figures, Georges-Henri Rivière, who was director from 1948 to 1966, and Hugues de Varine-Bohan, his successor until 1975, played a considerable role in defining the philosophy of the Association.[55] However, the specifically European frame of reference of ICOM was somewhat eclipsed in subsequent decades, while the institution's influence on the life of museums in Europe was weakened. Today it is largely the national associations that continue to be preponderant, even though other forms of international collaboration have made an appearance. Thus the European Museum of the Year award, founded by the English journalist Kenneth Hudson in 1977, has slowly come to define the specific criteria of museographic and museological excellence—before coming into crisis itself.[56] Even if these are close to those already put forward by ICOM and many national associations, they reveal a plurality of reference points within the increasingly complex landscape of European museums. The differing thematic networks, which display varying degrees of activity and influence, range from town museums to eco-museums, encompassing historical museums, or museums of agriculture and science, for example.[57] They testify to the growing specialization of collections and the autonomy of professional horizons of excellence for each category.[58] Lastly, the claim

---

[55] Georges-Henri Rivière, *La Muséologie selon Georges-Henri Rivière: Cours de muséologie: Textes et témoignages* (Paris, 1989).

[56] Kenneth Hudson*, Museums of Influence* (Cambridge, 1987).

[57] Peter Vergo, ed., *The New Museology* (London, 1989); André Desvallées, ed., *Vagues: Une anthologie de la nouvelle muséologie: Recueil de textes* (Lyon, 1992 and 1994); Peter Davis, *Ecomuseums: A Sense of Place*, (London, 1999).

[58] Patrick Boylan, ed., *Museums 2000: Politics, People, Professionals, and Profit* (London, 1992); Roger S. Miles and Lauro Zavala, eds., *Towards the Museum of the Future: New*

to universality by certain museums across the world, recently illustrated by a petition, invites a new mode of reading the relation to the global sphere, without privileging the European space any longer.[59] The emergence of community museums is another figure of this new modernity, which still eludes European tradition to a considerable degree.

The Exhibition

Since the 1970s the architect of a contemporary museum is expected to provide visitors with a simple and pleasant course to follow.[60] Two issues have monopolized the architect's attention; the first is that of lighting, both artificial and natural, while the second is that of the flexibility (or its absence) of the exhibition spaces. Recent decades have been marked by a succession of rival solutions such as that at the Pompidou Centre in Beaubourg, where, in 1984, Gae Aulenti replaced the open-plan fifth floor by Renzo Piano and Richard Rogers with a classical layout comprising a central avenue with exhibition spaces on either side, setting up a unidirectional flow tied to the chronology of the works being exhibited. Such museographical rearrangements echo wider debates about exhibition philosophy. Hence the great European curators of the generation of the 1970s and 1980s, Rudi Fuchs, Jan Hoet and Harald Szeemann, put forward new kinds of installations that went against the tradition of chronological evolution.[61] In the 1980s the dominant form of museum display was by artist. There then followed attempts at thematic exhibitions that rivalled this model. In 1996 Nicholas Serota, at the Tate, addressed this question in a particularly clear manner, in terms of *experience* or *interpretation*, which he considered the dilemma of the modern art museum for the younger

European Perspectives (London, 1994); Catherine Ballé and Dominique Poulot, *Musées en Europe: Une mutation inachevée* (Paris, 2004).

  [59] Eighteen museums from antiquities-importing countries have signed the *Declaration of the Importance and Value of Universal Museums* (2002). The Declaration first appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, 12 December 2002. It was republished in Ivan Karp, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja, and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, eds., *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations* (Durham, NC, 2006) 247–9.

  [60] Josep Maria Montaner, *Nouveaux Musées: Espaces pour l'art et la culture* (Barcelona, 1990); Angeli Sachs and Vittorio Lampugnani, eds., *Museums for a New Millennium: Concepts, Projects, Buildings*, (Munich, London and New York 1999).

  [61] James Putnam, *Art and Artifact: The Museum as Medium* (London, 2001); Rebecca DeRoo, *The Museum Establishment and Contemporary Art: The Politics of Artistic Display in France after 1968* (Cambridge, 2006).

generation.[62] More concretely, contemporary museums have tried to resolve problems related to storage spaces, work and public service. Some projects in the 1960s envisaged complete accessibility; the cinacotheques of the first Beaubourg in 1977 were mobile screens that the visitor could operate at will in order to view works that were not on display. The utopia of works in store being available to the visitor, or of a continuum from the museum to its reserve collections in the name of communication, has come ever closer to reality since. One example is the *Schaulager*, built by Herzog and de Meuron in Basel 'to store for display', making accessible to researchers all the works of the Emanuel Hoffmann Foundation (created in 1933) that are not exhibited in the municipal museums.[63]

In the second half of the twentieth century the notion of the museum as a coherent group of clearly delimited collections, hierarchically ordered, distributed with clear and unequivocal goals, has given way to a hybrid and multiform situation, in which the museum has explored different modalities of making its collections accessible. A substantial aspect of contemporary museum culture has consisted of a revisiting by museums of the genealogy of their collections, or the history of the taste of the generations of collectors and patrons who formed them.[64] More generally, reflection on the legitimacy and authenticity of the status of the museum has become a central aspect of the activity of institutions; hence, in 2001 at Tate Modern the artists Neil Cummings and Marysia Lewandowska examined notions of value, gratuitousness and free trade in their project *Capital*. The tendency of museums to reveal their successive modes of organization, notably at particular commemorations and anniversaries, promises much in the way of clarity with regards to their culture of display and their inscription at the heart of the history of art.

The erstwhile belief in direct contact with the work or the object, based on the principle that 'seeing is knowing', has given way to recognition of the need to provide the visitor with a mediated encounter. The museum has become an enjoyable experience, where the visitor, solicited by diverse forms of provocation and interactivity, is placed at the centre of its preoccupations and workings. Quite apart from the question of the validity of its choices for posterity, or of its interpretations of its artworks,

---

[62] Nicholas Serota, *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art* (London, 1997).

[63] See the website: http://www.schaulager.org (accessed 3 June 2010).

[64] Jean Galard, *Le regard instruit: Action éducative et action culturelle dans les musées* (Paris, 2000); Nick Merriman, *Beyond the Glass Case: The Past, the Heritage and the Public* (Leicester, 1991).

the museum therefore has to guarantee its visitors the pleasure of spe-
cific experiences, illustrating what Homi Bhabha has called the passage
from the abstract educational policy of the nineteenth century to the per-
sonal experience of the twenty-first. In other words, museums dedicate
more and more of their work to the demands of lived experience, to the
memories of the body and the senses, in the encounter with analysis and
knowledge, to which they once laid claim, in their older configuration, as
'civic laboratories'.[65]

---

[65] Tony Bennett, 'Civic Laboratories', *Cultural Studies* 19.5 (2005) 521–47.

ART HISTORY IN A GLOBAL FRAME: WORLD ART STUDIES

Wilfried van Damme and Kitty Zijlmans

Introduction

Some contributions to the public encyclopaedic endeavour Wikipedia are prefaced by the following warning: 'This entry does not have a world-wide focus'. Reflecting a growing awareness in our globalizing era of the need for a worldwide perspective in scholarship, this caveat is attached to entries that could reasonably be said to require treatment across cultures and throughout time (although it could equally reasonably be argued that in the end all topics benefit from a discussion in global terms, for example by putting into relief the topics' local contingencies). Should a similar warning be issued against the subject of this volume: the European study of art?

Some scholars would deny that there is a need for such a caution, not because they opine that European studies of art have a worldwide focus, but because they consider 'art' a Western intellectual construct that is by definition a local phenomenon, not a worldwide occurrence in space and time. Art is conceived in this mental framework as a cultural particularistic concept that describes not only certain products but the practices, discourses and attitudes that accompany them. Western conceptualizations and attending practices may, however, influence developments outside the West, which would require extending one's inquiries accordingly. Indeed, such an internationalization of relatively recent Western views on art as an 'autonomous' activity, highly individualistic, aiming at originality, and often produced for an international art market, is precisely what seems to have happened in the last few decades or more; one need but think of the art presented at Biennales across the globe today. In this process of internationalization, 'modern' Western art practices and views have become entangled with diverse traditions and developments outside the West, creating a variety of 'other modernities' in art worldwide.[1]

---

[1] See John Clark, *Modern Asian Art* (Honolulu, HI, 1998).

Despite this diversity, one presently talks of 'global art' that may be produced anywhere in the world today but that 'is always created as art to begin with', as opposed to, say, 'ethnographic art', which is seen rather as 'art by appropriation', never originally intended as 'art' (whatever the precise interpretation of that concept).[2] This type of global art has also been referred to recently as 'international art' or as *Weltgegenwartskunst*.[3] When European studies of art do take into account these present-day artistic expressions from all over the globe, they may be said to display a worldwide focus, albeit predominantly in space, considerably less so in time. Moreover, emphasis remains on what André Malraux called 'art by destination' (as opposed to 'art by metamorphosis'), leaving aside a multitude of contemporary visual expressions created in contexts other than academic art worlds.

Other scholars entertain a broader and more liberal understanding of the English word 'art' and its equivalents in other Western languages (as in other domains one would pragmatically use such terms as 'language', 'music', 'religion' or 'politics', to broadly designate or heuristically define particular fields of human endeavour). 'Art' may then be deployed as an umbrella term to refer to the human tendency to create, use, and respond to arresting visual images. The term 'art' is thus employed to concisely capture the universal propensity to transform visual media in order to attract beholders' attention—through shape, colour, and line, as well as through the subjects, meanings, and emotions that might be communicated or elicited by arrangements of such stimuli—and to deploy the resulting products in a variety of religious, political, social or educational contexts. This is an understanding of human artistic behaviour and its products that allows for an extension of the study of art not only in space but also in time, while at the same time allowing one to go beyond the confines of 'art by destination'. Following this or related conceptions, it seems safe to say, however, that the European study of art, and the teaching of its results, has to this day overwhelmingly lacked a worldwide focus, especially when we consider its institutionalized forms as practised in art history departments at European universities. A few provisos, however, are in order.

---

[2] Hans Belting, 'Contemporary Art as Global Art', in *The Global Art World: Audiences, Markets, and Museums*, ed. Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg (Ostfildern-Ruit, 2009) 44.

[3] Klaus Volkenandt, ed., *Kunstgeschichte und Weltgegenwartskunst: Konzepte, Methoden, Perspektiven* (Berlin, 2004).

To begin with, around the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, several German scholars in particular proposed that art scholarship take a global perspective—that it encompass 'the art of all times and peoples', to cite the title of Karl Woermann's multi-volume overview of 'world art', first published between 1900 and 1911.[4] The global orientation evident in some German-language art scholarship in the period between around 1890 and 1933 has recently been surveyed by Marlite Halbertsma and Ulrich Pfisterer.[5] Pfisterer observes that an openness to the art of the rest of the world, from both the present and the past, was promoted especially by the nascent field of *Kunstwissenschaft* (literally, the science of art), which strove to distinguish itself from the more conventional *Kunstgeschichte* (history of art). Whereas the latter focused on the West, *Kunstwissenschaft* proposed to investigate art in the context of humanity as a whole. This proposal was inspired in part by contemporary developments towards a global perspective in anthropology and psychology, and a positivistic intellectual climate favouring empirical approaches on a worldwide scale more generally. Pfisterer situates the intellectual battle between these two fields against the background of the late-nineteenth-century struggle for the academic institutionalization of the study of art.[6] The idea of studying art from a worldwide perspective, while leading to some interesting publications and arousing considerable public interest, did not ultimately succeed in German academia. Various interrelated factors have been suggested to explain this lack of success, including shifting intellectual interests, the rise of German nationalism, and the coming to power in 1933 of the Nazis and their views on Aryan racial and cultural superiority.[7]

A second proviso concerns the fact that the situation has started to slowly change at European universities over the last few years. At the University of East Anglia in Norwich, the School of World Art Studies and Museology opened its doors in 1992; the art history department of Leiden University has provided BA students with the opportunity to follow a minor in World Art Studies since 2003, and has been offering intercultural

---

[4] Karl Woermann, *Die Kunst aller Zeiten und Völker*, 6 vols. (Leipzig, 1900–11).

[5] Marlite Halbertsma, 'The Many Beginnings and One End of World Art History in Germany, 1900–1933', in *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, ed. Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme (Amsterdam, 2008) 91–105; Ulrich Pfisterer, 'Origins and Principles of World Art History: 1900 (and 2000)', in Zijlmans and van Damme, eds., *World Art Studies*, 69–89.

[6] Pfisterer, 'Origins and Principles', 71.

[7] Halbertsma, 'The Many Beginnings', 103; Pfisterer, 'Origins and Principles', 83–4.

courses on art within the context of an international Research Master since 2005; and the Institute for Art History at Berlin's Free University started an MA programme dedicated to 'Art History in Global Perspective', with an emphasis on Asia, in 2008. Similar initiatives are being developed elsewhere in Europe, including the University of Sussex and Copenhagen University.[8]

This chapter considers the question of how such initiatives towards a worldwide perspective in the study of art might be conceptually framed. It will also consider several topics of research that seem relevant once we start looking at the visual arts as a global phenomenon in time and space. To these ends, this contribution will briefly introduce the idea of 'world art studies' and three extensive themes of investigation that might be pursued within this paradigmatic context. World art studies will also be positioned within the contemporary debate on art and globalization, and related to the cognate field of postcolonial art studies. As a preliminary remark, we suggest that readers interpret world art studies as *world* art studies. In this way one might avoid the intimation that this field deals with *world art* studies, at least if the term 'world art' is conceived to designate not the art of the whole world in time and space, but to refer, in what has been called a 'modernist' and 'colonialist' fashion, to all the world's art except for modern Western art, and today's global or international art.[9]

World Art Studies, World Art History, and Global Art History

The concept of world art studies was coined in the early 1990s by John Onians, a professor of art history at the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom. It was Onians also who suggested that this new field of study be not only global in orientation but multidisciplinary in approach.[10] The multidisciplinary character that world art studies is developing, ranging from neuroscience to anthropology to philosophy, is one major way in which this nascent field distinguishes itself from related fields that are emerging today, specifically 'world art history' and 'global art history'. The emphasis on multidisciplinarity brings world art studies in fact closer to

---

[8] See James Elkins, 'Can We Invent a World Art Studies?' in Zijlmans and van Damme, eds., *World Art Studies*, 109.

[9] See Belting, 'Contemporary Art as Global Art', 41–4.

[10] John Onians, 'World Art Studies and the Need for a New Natural History of Art', *Art Bulletin* 78.2 (1996) 206–9.

yet another recent development, namely *Bildwissenschaft* or 'image-ology', which equally draws on a variety of relevant scholarly disciplines in its examination of visual images.[11]

There is presently some conceptual confusion as to the meaning of the qualifiers 'world' and 'global' in relation to 'art history'. One way to approach this problem is to take a lead from historian Bruce Mazlish's use of the term 'global history' in distinction to 'world history'.[12] Mazlish suggests that 'global history' distinguishes itself from 'world history' by concentrating on recent historical phenomena that reflect and affect a truly globalized, interconnected world. Examples would include the United Nations, established in 1945, but also for instance the recent development of 'world music', or the rise of a globalized economy with its multinational corporations and environmental problems on a worldwide scale. By analogy with Mazlish's suggestion, one could propose that 'global art history' focuses on worldwide and interrelated artistic developments in the present and the recent past.[13] 'World art history', by contrast, would then take into account the art of the whole of human history,[14] with the exception, perhaps, of the globalized art worlds of the last few decades (which would then be the domain of 'global art history'). One disadvantage of the label 'world art history', acknowledged by some of its proponents,[15] is the use of 'history' in the singular, potentially suggesting one homogeneous 'story of art' on a worldwide scale—hence also the plural *Stories of Art* of the title of James Elkins's book of 2002, exploring the question of whether or not the study of art's history might become more 'multicultural'.[16]

World art studies shares the topics and concerns now being examined in the developing field of world art history, albeit world art studies tends to construe the investigation of its issues, when appropriate, in interdisciplinary terms (calling on, say, evolutionary cognitive psychology or social anthropology, as the case may be). World art studies, being concerned

---

[11] See, for example, Klaus Sachs-Hombach, ed., *Bildwissenschaft: Disziplinen, Themen, Methoden* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005).

[12] Bruce Mazlish, 'An Introduction to Global History', in *Conceptualizing Global History*, ed. Bruce Mazlish and Ralph Buultjens (Boulder, CO, 1993).

[13] But see Belting, 'Contemporary Art as Global Art', 44.

[14] In one recent and prominent use of the term, however, world art history is limited to 'the West' and 'the East', see David Carrier, *A World Art History and Its Objects* (University Park, PA, 2008).

[15] See, for example, David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism* (London, 2003) 12.

[16] James Elkins, *Stories of Art* (New York, 2002). See also Elkins, ed., *Is Art History Global?* (New York, 2007).

with art in all its manifestations across time and space, pays attention also to the topics of what, it has been suggested, might be called global art history. World art studies may then add to the examination of these topics through the comprehensive perspective it offers not only in space but in time. It may thus, for example, situate recent international developments in art within the context of encounters and exchanges between art traditions that have occurred in humanity's past.

World Art Studies: Three Initial Topics of Investigation

Through its combined global and multidisciplinary approach, world art studies is creating a new framework or vantage point in the study of art from which to raise many new questions and address older ones afresh. In order to provisionally guide research in this budding field, the present authors have recently suggested that world art studies take on three basic themes of investigation that seem relevant once the visual arts are examined as a worldwide phenomenon across cultures and throughout history. These three extensive themes may be discussed here briefly.

The first of these concerns the earliest manifestations of art in human existence. This theme leads to examining questions such as: When and where did visual artistic behaviour first emerge in the evolution of *Homo sapiens*? What conditions made this behaviour possible—physical, mental, social, cultural? Why has the making and using of visual art been retained in the evolution of our species? After decades of relative neglect, the issue of art's origins is today keenly debated by specialists from an ever growing range of disciplines, including not only archaeology and art history, but cultural anthropology, evolutionary biology and neuroscience. One important impetus behind the rejuvenation of the study of the origins of art is the archaeological discoveries that have recently been made in Africa. These discoveries prompt us to completely reconsider early artistic behaviour in terms of both time and place. Indeed, it is now known that, rather than in Europe some 35,000 years ago, the oldest known types of visual artistic behaviour, in the form of bead production and the creation of geometric patterns, are to be found in Africa some 100,000 years ago. There are even indications that anatomically modern humans (*Homo sapiens*) may have already created sculptures and paintings before they left Africa to colonize the rest of the world perhaps some 65,000 years ago. Adding excitement to the field are various new, multidisciplinary theories attempting to explain the emergence of human art-making. These include

David Lewis-Williams's neuropsychological theory suggesting that the first images were created to record hallucinations of geometric patterns and animals as experienced by shamans in a state of trance.[17] An alternative account of Palaeolithic animal imagery has recently been provided by R. Dale Guthrie, who argues that such imagery resulted from their creators' profanely inspired fascination with the local wildlife.[18]

The second theme deals with the intercultural comparison of art in its context. The idea of comparing art in disparate human settings worldwide is a theoretically complicated and even controversial issue, involving conceptual, epistemological, and methodological problems. Indeed, some scholars deny the very possibility of intercultural comparison on the grounds that cultures and their art forms are incommensurable. They assume that each culture constitutes a closed conceptual and semantic universe that is sufficiently idiosyncratic to make comparisons with other cultures unwarranted (at least beyond the point of this 'comparative' conclusion). Scholars who do epistemologically allow intercultural comparisons to be made, face the problem of having to devise a conceptual apparatus that is 'culturally neutral' enough to be used in intercultural analyses. Specifically, they face the challenge of defining a *tertium comparationis*. This means they have to circumscribe the actual object of comparative analysis in such a manner that the researcher's cultural bias is minimized and a heuristic starting point is provided for an examination across cultural boundaries in time and space. In addition to these epistemological and conceptual considerations, one also has to think about formulating proper methods for comparing artistic phenomena interculturally (for example avoiding decontextualized analyses).

Intercultural comparison thus faces many theoretical challenges, yet it also holds the promise of elucidating a whole range of fundamental questions concerning the place and role of the visual arts in human existence. The topics of comparison are manifold, and may range from the more tangible to the more conceptual: from materials and techniques to the various contexts of art's use to aesthetic evaluation and philosophies of art. Aside from the topics to be investigated, intercultural comparison can take many forms, in terms of scope, method, and goal. Comparisons may be regional or global, synchronic or diachronic, or feature a combination

---

[17] David Lewis-Williams, *The Mind in the Cave: Consciousness and the Origins of Art* (London, 2002).
[18] Russell Dale Guthrie, *The Nature of Paleolithic Art* (Chicago, 2005).

of these. Intercultural comparison can proceed inductively, when cross-cultural data are examined in order to arrive at generalizations, but it may also have a more deductive flavour, when hypotheses concerning the visual arts are tested by drawing on available data from a variety of cultures. Intercultural comparative analysis may aim at highlighting differences, but it can also seek to establish commonalities on various levels of analysis. As an example of intercultural comparison in art, one may refer to Jean Borgatti's study of portraits worldwide. Conceiving of a portrait (Borgatti's *tertium comparationis*) as any visual creation that references a specific human being, Borgatti's comparative examination across space and time has led to an intercultural classification that consists of three basic types of portraits. In her analysis she distinguishes between representational portraits (which present a physiognomic likeness of an individual), generic portraits (stereotypical depictions that may be individualized by various means, including context of presentation, the addition of personal belongings, and inscriptions), and emblematic portraits (which refer to an individual by way of characteristic emblems or attributes).[19]

The third theme concerns interculturalization in the arts. This refers to the artistic influences that are exerted by one culture or tradition on another, or the mutual artistic cross-fertilization that takes place between two or more such analytical entities. Indeed, the concept of interculturalization (also used is 'transculturation') intends to avoid the connotation of one-way traffic that has become attached to the older concept of acculturation, by describing a potentially two-way process of cultural, in this case specifically artistic, exchanges between socio-cultural settings. Artistic exchanges between cultures have obviously become vary salient in recent years, yet such exchanges have been occurring in one form or another for most of human history.

The processes of visual artistic exchange between two or more cultures or contexts may be analysed on various levels. Thus one may focus on the preconditions of intercultural exchanges, which would include attention to both the availability of external artistic sources and individuals' willingness and motivations to incorporate such sources. Agency in the processes of intercultural exchange also constitutes a varied topic of examination (artistic influences are selectively incorporated, adapted, disseminated, and so on). The analysis should of course be geared as well

---

[19] See Jean M. Borgatti and Richard Brilliant, *Likeness and Beyond: Portraits from Africa and the World* (New York, 1990).

at the resulting artistic products, giving attention not only to the nature of the observable influences but also the impact and role of these objects in the setting in which they occur. Such an analytic framework may then be deployed to investigate the traffic of artistic influences going to and from a giving locality (from China, Korea, and Europe to Japan, from Japan to Europe, and so on).

In today's globalizing world, processes of interculturalization in the arts occur on an unprecedented scale. Globalization, however, implies not only a greatly increased cross-fertilization between various artistic traditions per se, but a host of related phenomena in the realm of art. These include the globalization of the art world and the art market, the institutionalization of contemporary art worldwide, and changing museum policies regarding the presentation and representation of art from around the globe. Globalization also implies such phenomena as the contemporary artist's nomadism, cultures' increased awareness of their artistic heritage, and a growing interest in writing both local and intercultural art histories. These issues not only make up the complex field of contemporary practices and discourses of art in a global context; as objects of scholarly investigation they are also part of the field of world art studies.[20]

Studying (Contemporary) Art in a Global Context

For some two decades, a number of interrelated developments have fuelled the study of contemporary art as a worldwide phenomenon. The first one is the recent acknowledgement that the global landscape of modern art derives its diversity from the emergence of a multitude of modernities in art all over the world in the course of the past century and a half. Each of them is constituted by different reactions to the past, in which the Western concept of Modernism is seen as an important driver, but not as the sole source.[21] A similar tendency to nuance the assumption that the West is constitutive of developments in art outside of Euro-America, and to break away from the concomitant and simplistic binary of the West versus the Non-West, can be observed in postcolonial studies.

---

[20] See also Peter J. Schneemann, 'Contemporary Art and the Concept of Art History. Influence, Dependency and Challenge', 59–73 in this volume.

[21] See Clark, *Modern Asian Art*; see also Geeta Kapur, *When was Modernism? Essays on Contemporary Cultural Practices in India* (New Delhi, 2000).

Alongside the broader concerns of world art studies, postcolonial studies can be seen as an approach that is particularly concerned with the impact of colonialism and its aftermath on art and culture. From the late 1970s onwards, postcolonial studies, exploring the various aspects (cultural, historical, political and economic) of the colonial encounter between the West and other cultures and how it has shaped the world, has gained much ground; it has grown into a field of discourse which is as vast as it is heterogeneous. Set in motion by scholars such as Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Stuart Hall and Homi Bhabha,[22] it is best described as a site of numerous investigations from many disciplines and theoretical perspectives, studying issues such as the formation of empires, colonizing and decolonizing practices, postcolonial history, culture and economy, the cultural productions of colonized societies, of marginalized people, etc.[23] It is predominantly a critical perspective investigating power relations in various contexts and executed by an increasing number of scholars from non-Euro-American countries.

One might suggest that the awareness of the postcolonial perspective in art and the contemporary art production of the so-called 'non-Western' world was triggered—however belatedly—by the debate prompted by the exhibition *'Primitivism' in 20th Century Art* (New York 1984) and its equally contested response *Magiciens de la Terre* (Paris 1989).[24] Although *Primitivism* aimed at showing the *affinities* between Western modern art and so-called tribal art, not intending to downgrade the so-called tribal art, the overall reception of the exhibition was negative, criticizing its organizer William S. Rubin for presenting tribal art merely as source material for a triumphant Modern (Western) Art.[25] To avoid stepping into the same trap

---

[22] See Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (London, 1968), first published 1952, an analysis of colonial subjugation on humankind, and *The Wretched of the Earth* (London, 1965) on decolonization; Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London, 1978) and *Culture and Imperialism* (London, 2003). Stuart Hall, ed., *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (London, 1997); Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London, 1994), reprinted 2005 with a new preface by the author.

[23] For a first attempt at an overview of theoretical concepts and issues, see: Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, eds., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (London and New York, 1995).

[24] *'Primitivism' in 20th Century Art. Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern* (New York, 1984) curated by William S. Rubin and Kirk Varnedoe, was followed five years later by *Magiciens de la Terre* (Paris, 1989) at the Centre Pompidou and the Grande Halle de la Vilette. In this exhibition the curator Jean-Hubert Martin aimed to show contemporary artists from all over the world on an equal basis claiming that art is not exclusively a 'Western' practice.

[25] See for example Thomas McEvilley, 'Doctor Lawyer Indian Chief. "Primitivism in 20th Century Art" at the Museum of Modern Art in New York', *Artforum International* 23 (November 1984) 54–61.

for *Magiciens*, the French curator Jean-Hubert Martin invited *contemporary* artists from both the Western and the non-Western world to jointly exhibit their work in Paris in 1989. Fierce criticism was directed at the white, Western male connoisseur who claimed the authority to select the artists from all over the world, and who ended up presenting worn-out stereotypes of a culturally grounded 'non-West' versus a sophisticated, conceptual 'West' and leaving out the unequal economic and power relations between the West and the rest of the world.[26] Martin was even accused of cultural imperialism.[27] Following his scathing judgment of the exhibition in *Third Text*, Rasheed Araeen responded with a counter-exhibition *The Other Story. Afro-Asian Artists in Post-War Britain* (London, South Bank Centre 1990), showing contemporary artists of mixed cultural background living in the UK.[28] However much criticism the exhibitions *Primitivism* and *Magiciens* received, they, and especially the latter, caused an avalanche of exhibitions all over the world and an ongoing discourse on modern and contemporary art worldwide that continues to the present.[29]

The approach to contemporary art and the global beyond the binary 'West'/'non-West' has been evident in a number of recent books which examine globalization in art. Examples are Geeta Kapur's volume of essays *When was Modernism?* (New Delhi 2000) and the recently published volume *Contemporary African Art Since 1980*, edited by the Nigerian-born scholars Okwui Enwezor and Chika Okeke-Agulu.[30] The latter investigates contemporary African art against the background of the major political and social changes of the period of decolonization, and a shifting perspective on and eventually the dissolving of the construct of centre/periphery. Both studies position artists in global contexts and attempt to move beyond traditional binary oppositions.

This quest to revise art history continues to gain ground. As people and places all over the globe become more and more interconnected, art history too, it is recognized, 'should attend not just to local questions, but

---

[26] See 'Marginalia: Thomas McEvilley on the Global Issue', *Artforum International* 28.7 (March 1990) 19–21.

[27] Jean Fisher, 'Invisible Histories: Magiciens de la Terre', *Artforum International* 28.1 (September 1989) 158–61.

[28] A landmark in discussing the exhibition *Magiciens* is Rasheed Araeen's 'Our Bauhaus, Others' Mudhouse', *The Third Text* 6 (1989) 3–16.

[29] A case in point is the *documenta* 11 exhibition of contemporary art in Kassel (Germany) in 2002 organized for the first time by a non-Euro-American curator, the Nigerian-born Okwui Enwezor.

[30] Geeta Kapur, *When was Modernism?* (New Delhi, 2000); Okwui Enwezor and Chika Okeke-Agulu, eds., *Contemporary African Art Since 1980* (Bologna, 2009).

to their larger, global dimensions'.[31] The 1,108 pages of the proceedings of the 32nd International Congress in the History of Art (CIHA), from which this statement is taken, testify to a more global awareness than any of the previous CIHA congresses. The basic question of the Congress was: what happens in the realm of art when one culture encounters another? This was expressed by the congress's title 'Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence', suggesting the opening up of the discipline to the world once more—once more, considering the global orientation of the discipline in its early beginnings in late-nineteenth-century Germany (as mentioned above), yet this time in totally different circumstances. In addition to the numerous empirical perspectives, angles, and case studies in the proceedings, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann's section on 'The Idea of World Art History' dealt with methodological and ideological perspectives. Each of the contributions to this section scrutinized the way in which art might be addressed when viewed from a global frame of reference, for example when seen from the margins (at the same time asking critically who it is that defines these 'margins'). The 2008 CIHA Congress clearly showed major changes in thinking about what constitutes the boundaries of the fields of art history and visual studies as well as a shift towards world art studies.

A second change that has become increasingly visible—although not central to world art studies as originally conceived by Onians—has been a shift of focus in the study of art from the modern to the contemporaneous, prompted by the vast production of contemporary art worldwide. A major subject for debate is the notion of contemporaneity itself, referring to a shift away from modernism to the conditions of the here and now and the way in which art alludes to the multiplicity of being in space and time today.[32] Contemporary world art studies would then imply an examination of art that is contemporaneous and created by a diverse group of artists worldwide, basing their work on a variety of local, regional, and intercultural artistic sources. This worldwide production of art operates in opposition to the concept of art of traditional Western art history, 'as it aims to reclaim equality without the former borders separating art from indigenous and popular production'.[33] This would also imply a reconsid-

---

[31] Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, 'Section: The Idea of World Art History', in *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, ed. Jaynie Anderson (Melbourne, 2009) 72.

[32] Terry Smith, 'Writing the History of Contemporary Art', in Anderson, ed., *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 918–21.

[33] Belting, 'Contemporary Art as Global Art', 48.

eration of the structure and programmes of art museums as well as museums of anthropology.

This brings us to a third major issue: the role of the museum in deciding which art is to be presented and collected worldwide. Not only will Western museums of modern art and of anthropology have to rethink their selection criteria and collection strategies in order to meet the needs of the globalizing world of today, museums outside Europe, North America and Australasia are also confronted with this challenge. In all these cases, traditional notions of 'the West', of 'non-Western' art, of nationally defined versus tribal cultures, and so forth, are to be critically assessed and revised. A new vocabulary and new presentations are needed, fuelled by an interconnected local/global input.[34] The identification of the art concept as a solely Western phenomenon no longer holds; instead, the emphasis is on regionally and locally connected *art worlds* and their multiple notions of art and culture.[35]

Of importance regarding the globalization of art, finally, is the study of the role of the art market and of art-world systems, both locally and on a global scale, and more particularly, how these markets and systems are related, and what the forces are behind decision making in cultural matters worldwide.[36] World trade, labour markets and money flows are constituents of the art world where art is seen not so much as a concept but as a commodity. Interestingly, many contemporary artworks discuss and criticize precisely these power plays and intricacies of politics and economy. Contemporary art can therefore be seen as a school of study opening up many vistas on the world, be it local and site-specific or—more general and challenging—focused on world issues such as global trade, the environment, or the migration of people. Seen as physical sites of encounter, the artworks act as agents to stimulate discussion and exchange, and to incite further exploration of the themes and subject matter presented. As forms of cultural analysis themselves, the artworks then engage the viewer in a search for his/her connection to the world. In that respect, contemporary art from around the globe is as explorative an investigation of being human as is world art studies.

---

[34] Peter Weibel and Andrea Buddensieg, eds., *Contemporary Art and the Museum. A Global Perspective* (Ostfildern, 2007).

[35] Charlotte Bydler, *The Global Art World Inc. On the Globalization of Contemporary Art*, Figura Nova Series 32 (Uppsala, 2004).

[36] Joost Smiers, *Arts under Pressure: Promoting Cultural Diversity in the Age of Globalization.* (London and New York, 2003).

THE CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL ART HISTORIES
AND THE 'NEW' EUROPE

Matthew Rampley

Introduction

In his *Lectures on Architecture*, published between 1863 and 1872, Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc outlined a theory of national identity that centred on the distinction between sympathetic and political civilizations. The latter, of which the Roman Empire was a pre-eminent historical example, consisted of states formed out of diverse peoples with little connection to each other, and held together by mutual economic or political interest, or by force of arms. In contrast, the sympathetic civilization is 'one which develops in the midst of an agglomeration of men of the same race or races that have certain affinities with each other', of which the Greeks provide the quintessential example.[1] The contrast between the Greeks and the Romans is thus one between a homogeneous people and a heterogeneous polity: 'it is not proper to speak of the Roman *people*', they are, he argued, an administrative or political body.

   This distinction anticipated the later opposition drawn by the German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies between the organic pre-modern community ('Gemeinschaft') and the alienated society ('Gesellschaft') of modern times, and took up a topic that would become a standard theme in sociological literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[2] Viollet-le-Duc expanded the division of civilizations by reference to the visual arts, for art can only be the product of a people: 'there was not, properly speaking, any Roman art: there was only an organization of art belonging to foreign peoples,—a very perfect organization, I allow, but which was not, and could not be, the expression of the genius of a people.'[3] Art could only be the expression of a people, and Viollet-le-Duc was openly critical of cosmopolitanism; as Eric Michaud has demonstrated,

---

[1] Eugène Viollet-le-Duc, *Lectures on Architecture*, trans. Benjamin Bucknell, I (New York, 1877) 203.

[2] Ferdinand Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (1887) (Darmstadt, 2005).

[3] Viollet-le-Duc, *Lectures on Architecture*, 203.

Viollet-le-Duc also approvingly referred to the writings of Gobineau, thus giving his theory of art and civilization a distinctly racist overtone.[4]

Viollet-le-Duc's work was not, of course, unique; within France a virulently nationalist and racist reading of art history was developed by his younger contemporary Louis Courajod (1841–1896), who mourned the death of French art at the hands of cosmopolitanism and who complained that 'We possess an art that is accessible to an international elite of Latinate initiates, an art that takes great care to appear timeless and devoid of homeland ['patrie'] and which looks down on the idea of satisfying the needs of its time or the needs of its home, an art that demands a special culture in order to be understood'.[5]

Racism in art history has become particularly associated with the reactionary politics of later German and Austrian art historians such as Josef Strzygowski (1862–1941) or Dagobert Frey (1883–1963), but talk of race, or of racial constants became commonplace in art-historical literature. Even a figure such as Alois Riegl (1858–1905), renowned for his cosmopolitan outlook, has been accused of employing terms (specifically, the notion of the collective 'Kunstwollen') with distinctly racial overtones.[6]

Such theories represent an extreme case of the much wider intertwining of art history with the politics of national identity, which was often understood in racial terms. Art history emerged as a modern discipline at the same time as the rise of theories of race, and these became quickly intertwined with Romantic notions of national art and literature.[7] Thus Johann J. Winckelmann, in his *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (History of the Art of Antiquity, 1764), saw specific artistic styles as the expression of specific racial characters and of their 'manner of thinking', establishing a pattern that became a standard element in art-historical literature.[8]

Much critical attention has been devoted to the presence of nationalist and racist thinking in Austro-German art history, and this has been informed by retrospective awareness of the catastrophe of 1933–1945 and the implication of many German and Austrian art historians the politics

---

[4] Eric Michaud, 'Nord et Sud. Du nationalisme et du racisme en histoire de l'art', in Michaud, *Histoire de l'art: Une discipline à ses frontières* (Paris, 2005) 49–84.

[5] Louis Courajod, *Leçons professés à l'école du Louvre (1887–1896) I: Origines de l'art roman et gothique* (Paris, 1899) 227.

[6] See for example, Ernst H. Gombrich, *The Sense of Order: A Study in the Psychology of Decorative Art* (London, 1994) 182.

[7] See Hubert Locher, 'Stilgeschichte und die Frage der "nationalen Konstante"', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte* LIII (1996) 285–93.

[8] Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave (Los Angeles, 2006).

of Nazism.[9] However, the high degree of attention to this topic risks omitting from view the fact that the intertwining of art history and nationalist politics was a Europe-wide phenomenon.

Art History and National States

Even if stripped of its more extreme expressions of racist ideology, art history was shaped by the politics of national identity, and in a number of ways. The division of art into national 'schools' became fixed at an early stage in the history of the discipline. Franz Kugler's *Handbook of Art History* of 1842, the first comprehensive art-historical survey, saw modern European art as organized into German, French, Italian, Spanish and English national styles and practices.[10] This did not, of course, correspond to the political map of the mid-nineteenth century, and there is no reference in Kugler to 'Prussian', or 'Austrian' or 'Piedmontese' art, for example. Nevertheless, the approximate delineation of art into nationally-defined regions formed the pattern that became sharpened and more sensitive to variations as increasing numbers of nationalist ideologues sought recognition, throughout the nineteenth century, for their own national identities. Thus it came to be taken as axiomatic by Czech, Spanish, Italian or French art historians, for example, that the history of art had an essential role to play in the assertion and development of ethnic and national identities, and that art historians' first duty was a patriotic promotion of their own cultural identities. In many cases such assertions emerged in opposition to the existing political structure of nineteenth-century Europe; this was particularly marked in the multi-ethnic empires of Germany, Austria-Hungary or Tsarist Russia.

In many others, nationalist art histories were aligned with the interests of the state, and were promoted as part of official cultural policy, and supported with the lavish resources of government. This underpinned the foundation not only of institutions of higher education but also of the larger apparatus of art-historical research, including the funding of scholarly publishing and of art galleries and museums. Thus the founding of

---

[9] On this topic see Jutta Held, Dirk Janssen, Bettina Kohlstedt, Martin Papenbrock, Sophie Reinhardt, Hilde Schreiner, and Rosemarie Sprute, red., *Kunstgeschichte an den Universitäten im Nationalsozialismus: Kunst und Politik, Jahrbuch der Guernica-Gesellschaft* 5 (Göttingen, 2003); see also Charlotte Schoell-Glass, 'Art History in German-Speaking Countries: Germany, Austria and Switzerland', 335–353 in this volume.

[10] Franz Kugler, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1842).

the École des Chartes in Paris in 1821 was explicitly linked to the policy of preserving France's heritage ('patrimoine') and national identity, and it is symptomatic that French art history in the nineteenth century was dominated by medieval scholars, including Viollet-le-Duc, for whom a major concern was the conservation and restoration of the architectural legacy of the Middle Ages.[11] As Donald Preziosi has argued, art history in the nineteenth century had a museographic function, and it is no coincidence that the École du Louvre was an important site of art-historical teaching and research.[12] A parallel instance can be found in Austria-Hungary; the Institute of Austrian Historical Research, early home of the Vienna School, was founded in emulation of the École des Chartes, and its function was to support research that would underpin the legitimizing ideology of the Habsburg Empire, creating the sense of a shared transnational artistic and cultural heritage. It has long been recognized that the Vienna School was an important contributor to this, promoting a cosmopolitan vision of artistic evolution and resisting narrowly nationalistic interpretations of art history.[13] The development of Viennese art history occurred in parallel with that of other artistic institutions; the Kunsthistorisches Museum was founded as a public art gallery in 1891, while Rudolf Eitelberger (1817–1885), the first Chair in art history, had been directly involved in the establishment of the Museum of Art and Industry in 1864. Although the complex history of Italy precluded the formation of national institutions comparable to the Louvre, the Kunsthistorisches Museum or the École des Chartes, the development of art-historical research was similarly aligned with the policy of the newly unified state. Thus an important aim of Adolfo Venturi's *History of Italian Art* (1901–1940) was to overcome the dominance of writing on Italian art history by foreign, especially German, scholars.[14] Venturi also co-authored a tract on Dalmatia during the First World War that exaggerated its Italian cultural legacy, and which was aligned with the wider Italian war aim of annexing the Austrian province as a reward for entering the war against Germany and Austria-Hungary.[15]

---

[11] On the development of Art History in France see Lyne Therrien, *L'histoire de l'art en France: Génèse d'une discipline universitaire* (Paris, 1998).

[12] Donald Preziosi, *Brain of the Earth's Body: Art, Museums and the Phantasms of Modernity* (Minneapolis, MN, 2003).

[13] See Margaret Olin, 'Alois Riegl: the Late Roman Empire in the Late Habsburg Empire', *Austrian Studies* 5 (1994) 107–20.

[14] Adolfo Venturi, *Storia dell'arte italiana*, 25 vols. (Milan, 1901–1940).

[15] Adolfo Venturi, Ettore Pais, and Pompeo Molmenti, *Monumental Dalmatia* (Milan, 1917).

The establishment of new states in Europe after 1918 gave further impetus to this drive, when art-historical literature in Armenia, Romania, Turkey or Poland, for example, was a participant in the construction of ideologies of national identity.[16] Such a national orientation was given formal acknowledgement in the Thirteenth International Congress of the History of Art held in Stockholm in 1933, in which national art was the major theme.[17]

National Art History after 1945

The fact that art history was so closely linked to nationalist ideologies during the establishment of the nation states of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is less demanding of commentary than the persistence of such discourses to the present. While military defeat of the Nazi régime and other associated right-wing dictatorships led to a discrediting of explicitly racist ideologies, a concern with the expression of national character in art remained prominent. Perhaps the best known example was Pevsner's analysis of 'Englishness' in art, qualities of which included 'tolerance', 'conservatism' and 'practical sense'.[18] Pevsner's study appeared in 1956, an important time in the development of art history in England. The first volumes of the *Oxford History of English Art* had already been completed, and this project was, as the general editor Thomas Boase stated, an overt attempt to introduce the traditions of 'Continental' art history to England.[19] Boase adopted a self-deprecatory tone, and this was matched in the first volume of the series, devoted to the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. As its author Joan Evans concluded, 'We must not allow our natural sympathy with the English middle ages . . . to blind us to the true proportions of its art. That art has the qualities of the art of a small country; it is more often decorative and pretty than monumental or noble.'[20] Yet such apparent modesty drew on tropes to do with English national character; reticence was highlighted as a natural virtue, and was matched by the qualities of 'naturalness' and 'a touching kind of simplicity'

---

[16] On this topic see Robert Born, Alena Janatková, and Adam Labuda, eds., *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der nationale Diskurs* (Berlin, 2003).

[17] Johnny Roosval, ed., *XIIIᵉ Congrès international d'histoire de l'art, Stockholm 4–7 septembre 1933* (Stockholm, 1933).

[18] Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Englishness of English Art* (London, 1956).

[19] Thomas Boase, 'Editor's Preface', in Joan Evans, *English Art 1307–1461* (Oxford, 1949) v.

[20] Evans, *English Art 1307–1461*, 223.

that Evans also identified in English art. These, and similar qualities, reappeared in Pevsner's account of Englishness in art, and were adopted as bourgeois emblems of English national identity. Although the *Oxford History* did not adopt the strident tone of pre-war national histories, it nevertheless provided an occasion for speculation concerning English culture, identity and history. Thus David Talbot-Rice's volume on early medieval art emphasized that while Anglo-Saxon art had been subjected to Continental European artistic influence, it had retained its essential 'Englishness', while he also lay patriotic claim to the pre-eminence of English manuscript illumination of the period.[21]

Denis Farr's study of English modernism, the last of the series to be published, appeared in 1979.[22] This coincided with the publication of a very different kind of national art history, the *Storia dell'arte italiana*, edited, initially, by Giovanni Previtali and, later, Federico Zeri.[23] The first volumes of this large-scale project addressed a wide range of methodological and historiographical concepts, such as the formation of art history as a discipline, the role of the artist, methods of interpretation, the artistic public, and the relation between peripheries and centres. In contrast to Venturi's history of Italian art of half a century earlier, the social history of art was also prominent, reflecting wider shifts in the disciplinary orientation in the 1970s and 1980s. Basic values and assumptions were subjected to critical scrutiny, and this extended to an interrogation of the national paradigm. Previtali's contribution on periodization brought into question the pertinence of the term 'Italian' art for the period prior to the formation of the national state: 'the Selinunte metopes, the Ravenna mosaics, the Romanesque of Padua are sublime episodes in the history of humanity, but they had no part to play in the history of Italian art...[until] Italians of the decadent movement reintegrated them into their own national consciousness.'[24]

The *Storia dell'arte italiana* was the most ambitious post-war attempt at the construction of a national art history, but its self-critical stance cast into doubt the notion of histories of art oriented around the nation state. Even stripped of the aggressive nationalism of the first half of the century, the nation state as the frame of reference presents profound ideological

---

[21] David Talbot Rice, *English Art 871–1100* (Oxford, 1952).
[22] Denis Farr, *English Art 1870–1940* (Oxford, 1979).
[23] Giovanni Previtali, *Storia dell'arte italiana* (Turin, 1979–1982).
[24] Giovanni Previtali, 'The Periodization of Italian Art History', in *History of Italian Art*, II, trans. Claire Dorey (Cambridge, 1994) 5.

difficulties. Previtali's comment makes this explicit; on the one hand the notion of 'Italian' art history can clearly only be a correlate of the notion of a specifically Italian identity that did not exist until the eighteenth century. As Previtali himself acknowledges, this opens the door to romantic reactionary interpretations that equate the nation with a homogeneous, unitary group; art by those who do not belong to the group is then arbitrarily excluded, even if located on the same territory. In the late nineteenth century, for example, Czech and Austro-German art historians made competing claims to ownership of the artistic and architectural heritage of Bohemia, to the exclusion of the other group.[25] This relied, of course, on the ideological fantasy of the ethnically homogeneous culture, and set ideas of nation against those of state. Alien elements within the boundaries of the state are eliminated in the history of the national art and, conversely, political borders that fragment ethnically conceived 'nations' are also dismissed, resulting in narratives that assert their rights over the territories of others. The most notorious—but not unique—example, perhaps, is Dagobert Frey's work on Cracow in the 1940s, which assimilated it to German art history and minimized the presence of Jewish and Polish culture.[26]

No culture is, of course, homogeneous; its boundaries are porous, and the attempt to identify the essential national characteristics of art is one of the ideological delusions characteristic of the modern era. Moreover, as theorists of nationalism such as Benedict Anderson or Ernst Gellner have asserted, national identity is a function of processes of modernization; the various local, regional and supra-regional identities of the pre-modern era cannot be seen as the slumbering precursors of modern national consciousness.[27]

Reliance on the *politically* defined state instead of the nation conceived in ethnic terms, while not vulnerable to the same racist fantasies, is equally problematic, however. Two immediate problems surface. First, state boundaries are in continual flux; it is thus difficult to ascertain what the geographical scope should be of a national art history, given that its basic object is constantly being redefined. Should the history of medieval English art include the monuments from the territories of the English

---

[25] See for example Alfred Woltmann, *Deutsche Kunst in Prag* (Leipzig, 1877); Ferdinand Lehner, *Dějiny umění národa českého* (Prague, 1903).

[26] Dagobert Frey, *Krakau* (Berlin, 1941).

[27] See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983); Ernst Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford, 2nd edn., 2006).

monarchs such as Gascony or Aquitaine located in modern-day France? Such a politically defined national art history can, moreover, serve the territorial ambitions of states. Following the First World War, Hungary, for example, was stripped of some two thirds of its territory, which was then allocated to the new states of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania. Many Hungarian art historians of the interwar period continued to treat monuments in Transylvania, Slovakia or Croatia as part of 'Hungarian' art history, however, either deliberately or inadvertently supporting the irredentist claims of those who refused to recognize the new boundaries.[28]

The second difficulty in the use of the politically defined state as the frame of reference for the construction of national art histories follows on from the first, and lies in the extent to which they correspond to coherent cultural and artistic spaces. While modern European nation states attempted to create a uniform national identity, a process in which art practices, together with the institutions of the wider art world played no small part, political and cultural boundaries have never coincided in such a neat manner. This was already acknowledged by art historians in the late nineteenth century; Aby Warburg's studies of Florence highlighted the complex mix of cultural forces at work in fifteenth-century Florence, in which the work of Florentine painters and sculptors was consumed alongside that of Netherlandish and Burgundian artists.[29] More recent scholarship has also highlighted the extensive cultural exchange between the Italian states and the Ottoman Empire.[30] Goods, images and artists crossed political boundaries, a process that presents important challenges to nationally oriented art histories, whether conceived along racial or purely political and administrative lines. Even in the modern era the systematic efforts of states to instil a sense of a national cultural and artistic identity were undercut by the international mobility of artistic ideas and practices, and to this must be added recognition of constantly shifting political territories and the fact that some states have had a very short historical existence.

---

[28] Tibor Gerevich, *Magyarországi művészet Szent István korában* (Budapest, 1938).

[29] Aby Warburg, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity* (1932), trans. David Britt (Los Angeles, 1999).

[30] Lisa Jardine and Jerry Brotton, *Global Interests: Renaissance Art Between East and West* (London, 2003); Rosamond E. Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300–1600* (Los Angeles, 2001); Gerald Maclean, ed., *Reorienting the Renaissance: Cultural Exchanges with the East* (London, 2005).

It might be assumed that given these numerous problems, the production of large-scale national histories of art belongs to an earlier phase of the development of the discipline. Recent events, however, reveal such teleological assumptions to be flawed; although authors such as Ulrich Beck have argued for a transnational and cosmopolitan vision of Europe, their aspirations are confounded by the continued influence of the national paradigm, also visible in art history.[31] Thus between 1998 and 2002 the Austrian Academy of Sciences sponsored a highly successful and popular six-volume history of Austrian art, which limited itself entirely to the space of the modern Austrian Republic.[32] The almost complete lack of reference to the wider context of the former Habsburg Empire produced an insular narrative with an attenuated historical account of the meaning of 'Austria'. The *History of Fine Art in Austria* coincided with the publication of a three-volume history of German art. In his foreword to the second volume of the *History of German Art*, Martin Warnke states:

> This book on German art does not contain a single sentence regarding the essence of German art. It is important to know when, where and why there arose the need for an answer to this question, and how, in the course of history, answers were formulated. However, it would also be a restriction if the artistic products of the geographic, historical and linguistic space we call Germany could not also be seen as having meaning and value.[33]

Thus 'Germany' has an assumed cultural unity that entitles Warnke to write a history of its art, but he also acknowledges that it is arbitrary to limit that history to the present borders of the German state: 'One could not write a "German art history" if Austria, Switzerland, Poland or the Czech lands could not loan out, as it were, important components of their artistic possessions to our history. The concept of a national heritage that is connected to territorial claims finally belongs, I hope, in the past.'[34]

This new German art history thus includes the sculptures of Veit Stoss in Cracow, Benedikt Ried's architectural work in Prague, or Fischer von Erlach's Karlskirche in Vienna. Warnke is of course right to point out the arbitrariness of relying solely on existing political boundaries. The

---

[31] Ulrich Beck and Edgar Grande, *Das kosmopolitische Europa* (Frankfurt am Main, 2007).

[32] Hermann Filitz, ed., *Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Österreich*, 6 vols. (Munich and New York, 1998–2002).

[33] Martin Warnke, 'Vorwort' to Warnke, *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst, II: Spätmittelalter und Frühe Neuzeit, 1400–1750* (Munich, 1999) 8.

[34] Warnke, *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst*, 8.

difficulty arises, however, when, despite his protestations to the contrary, one considers the criteria by which these works become part of 'German' art. The territories covered by Warnke coincide with those of the Holy Roman Empire, although this is nowhere stated explicitly. As Hans Belting has argued, however, in the wake of the Second World War many German and Austrian art historians retreated into a concern with the Holy Roman Empire as a politically acceptable surrogate for a problematic German national art history.[35] By refusing to state explicitly the meaning of the term 'German' Warnke becomes vulnerable to the accusation of mobilizing older and problematic tropes of national identity. This suspicion is given further fuel by the first volume in the series, covering the period from 600–1400, in which the meaning of 'German' takes on shifting meanings; at one time it implies all Germanic tribes (including the Anglo-Saxons), at another it is limited to the Merovingian dynasty, and then to the Carolingian Empire.[36] At times it is defined territorially, at others, ethnically, and then at still others, politically.

National Art History in the Present

The national paradigm has, if anything, strengthened in recent decades; thus, at the same time as the German and Austrian ventures, in Britain a popular television series on the history of British Art was broadcast by the BBC in 1999, followed, in 2000, by two histories of Scottish art.[37] More recently the Tate has sponsored an ambitious three-volume project on *The History of British Art*.[38] In some parts of Europe national histories of art have been given a new impetus, namely, the demise of the Communist bloc.[39] The collapse of old social and political certainties engendered by the fall of the Soviet Union led to an extensive search for self-definition by the states that emerged. Established states, such as Poland, Hungary or Romania, were concerned to construct histories that would replace official

---

[35] See Hans Belting, *The Germans and their Art: A Troublesome Relationship*, trans. Scott Kleager (London and New Haven, CT, 1998).

[36] Heinrich Klotz, *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst, I: Mittelalter 600–1400* (Munich, 1997).

[37] Andrew Graham-Dixon, *A History of British Art* (London, 1999); Murdo Macdonald, *Scottish Art* (London, 2000); Duncan Macmillan, *Scottish Art, 1416–2000* (Edinburgh, 2000).

[38] David Bindman and Chris Stephens, eds., *The History of British Art* (London, 2008).

[39] On the rise of nationalism see Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge, 1996); Richard Caplan and John Feffer, eds., *Europe's New Nationalism: States and Minorities in Conflict* (Oxford, 1996).

Communist narratives and serve the creation of new post-Communist identities. Newly (re-)created states, such as Croatia, Ukraine, those in the Baltic, or Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan sought to author national histories which, at times, could draw on episodes of independent nationhood in the past—but which in some cases constructed a 'national' past and culture where none had previously existed. In some cases the construction of new identities led to the destruction of existing states; the breakup of Czechoslovakia was in part due to the notion of a separate Slovak nationality exploited for ideological purposes by the Slovak political leadership in the early 1990s. The recreation of identities was, in its most tragic cases, accompanied by a virulent nationalist racism, as in the civil war in the former Yugoslavia.[40] Such wider political imperatives left a visible imprint on art-historical writing in a number of ways. Not only were new political realities created; in addition, art historians were concerned with overcoming the legacy of the governmental control of scholarship, which bestowed legitimacy on certain topics and removed it from others. Consideration of a few cases indicates the issues involved.

 In 1984 the first volume was published of the *History of Czech Art*, a large-scale project that was not completed until 2007.[41] Intended as a comprehensive history of art in six volumes of Czech art from 'the beginning', it revealed a sense of the tensions that already existed in the communist Czechoslovak state prior to 1989. Concentrating exclusively on Bohemia, Moravia and Czech-speaking Silesia, it privileges the major artistic centres of Prague, Brno and Olomouc. In certain respects this corresponds to the different historical trajectories of the Czech and Slovak parts of the state; Slovakia had always been politically part of Hungary. The Czech regions of Bohemia and Moravia, as part of the Holy Roman Empire, lay within a different cultural orbit. Key historical points of reference are provided by the Great Moravian Empire of the ninth and tenth centuries, Charles IV, King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor from 1355 to 1378, and Rudolf II, Holy Roman Emperor from 1576 to 1612. Their importance is not in question, but their inclusion is also due to their place within the mythology of

---

[40] See Kate Hudson, *Breaking the South Slav Dream: The Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia* (London, 2003).

[41] Rudolf Chadraba, ed., *Dějiny Českého Výtvarného Umění: Od Počátků do Konce Středověku* (Prague, 1984). The final volume was Rostislav Švácha and Marie Platovská, eds., *Dějiny Českého Výtvarného Umění, 1958–2000* (Prague, 2007).

Czech national historiography, for both recalled periods when Prague was at the centre of the Holy Roman Empire.[42]

However, if the exclusion of Slovakia in this project was meant to reflect their separate history, it became problematic in the case of the discussion of Romanesque art, for the Great Moravian Empire of that period encompassed areas of present-day Slovakia and Poland. As with the more recent *History of Fine Art in Austria*, the idea of the Czech territories as forming a distinctive cultural unit is, in any case, questionable. Although there is some reference to non-Czech artists and architects in Bohemia and Moravia such as Fischer von Erlach, Santini, Jan Josef Wirch or Peter Brandl, little sense is provided of the wider cultural and artistic networks within which 'Czech' art was located.[43]

The later volumes of this publication adopt a more complex approach to the meaning of the term 'Czech' art history. Discussion of the early modernist period recognizes the multi-cultural nature of the newly Czechoslovak state; avant-garde groups such as *Osma* ('The Eight') comprised both Czech- and German-speaking artists, and leading designers and architects were from the German-speaking (and Jewish) minority.[44] However, significant omissions continue. Slovakia is still absent, even though institutions, such as the School of Applied Arts, the so-called 'Bratislava Bauhaus', were deeply enmeshed within Czech modernist culture.[45] The *History of Czech Art* has to be approached not in terms of identifying the individual omissions, however, but in terms of its ideological significance. For it is marked by a discourse of Czech national identity that was given a further impetus in the mid-1990s when the new Czech state was faced with the task of constructing a new post-communist and post-*Czechoslovak* identity.

A slightly different set of issues is raised by the case of Estonia. As Krista Kodres, a contributor to this volume, has indicated, the single most ambitious project of contemporary Estonian art-historical scholarship is the new *History of Estonian Art*.[46] The primary goal is to retrieve the historiography of Estonian art from the legacy of the official doctrine of the Soviet

---

[42] On the mythologies of Czech history see Derek Sayer, *The Coasts of Bohemia: A Czech History* (Princeton, NJ, 1998).

[43] A rather different approach is provided in Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Court, Cloister, and City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe, 1450–1800* (Princeton, NJ, 1995).

[44] See Lenka Bydžovská, Vojtěch Lahoda, and Karel Srp, *Dějiny Českého Výtvarného Umění, 1890–1938* (Prague, 1998).

[45] On the school see Iva Mojžišova, 'Avant-Garde Repercussions and the School of Applied Arts in Bratislava, 1928–1939', *Journal of Design History* 5.4 (1992) 273–9.

[46] Krista Kodres, ed., *Eesti Kunsti Ajalugu, 2: 1520–1770* (Tallinn, 2005).

era, and also to establish a history that would be methodologically defensible, in contrast to the few previous attempts.[47] Although part of the current renegotiation of Estonian cultural identity, the project explicitly aims to avoid lapsing into nationalistic historiography: 'It is necessary to deconstruct the mythical national discourse of the history of Estonian art and start to interpret art in terms of the real political, social, economic, mental and aesthetic conditions and concepts of the time being studied.'[48]

However, this is not so straightforward. As Kodres herself admits, a fundamental difficulty is presented by the meaning of 'Estonian' art history. Until 1918 there was no Estonia and, in contrast to the Czechs, there was no prior political entity to which Estonian nationalists could look back. Alternatively part of Denmark, Sweden and the Russian Empire, the situation of Estonia was rendered more complex by the fact that the high culture of cities such as Tallinn (then Reval) was dominated by the German bourgeoisie who had successfully constructed a distinctive and self-conscious Baltic German culture and identity.[49] The major artistic works were thus monuments to German and Russian culture; the best known architectural structure in Tallinn, for example, is the Kadriorg Palace, built as a summer palace by Peter the Great. Estonian art history here becomes inseparable from that of Russia.

The complexities of identifying an 'Estonian' art history extended to the question of art-historical discourse.[50] A recent anthology of the history of Estonian art-historical literature is striking in its inclusion of mostly German writings until the late nineteenth century, when an Estonian-speaking middle class first emerged.[51] This paralleled the artistic situation; the first recognizably 'Estonian' artists first emerged in the early twenti-eth century.[52] Art historians in Estonia are thus presented with a highly

---

[47] The interwar period saw the publication of Alfred Vaga's *Eesti Kunsti Ajalugu* (Tallinn, 1932).

[48] Krista Kodres, 'How to Write Art History: the Estonian Experience', *Acta Historiae Artium Balticae* 1 (2005) 12.

[49] On the history of Germans in the Baltic see Gert von Pistohlkors, ed., *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas*, 10, 'Baltische Länder' (Berlin, 1994).

[50] Wilhelm Neumann, *Grundriss einer Geschichte der bildenden Künste und des Kunst-gewerbes in Liv-, Est- und Kurland von Ende des 12. bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Reval, 1887). See, too, Neumann, *Baltische Maler und Bildhauer des XIX. Jahrhunderts: Biographische Skizzen mit den Bildnissen der Künstler und Reproduktionen nach ihren Werken* (Riga, 1902).

[51] See Juta Keevallik, Rein Loodus, and Lehti Viiroja, eds., *Tekste kunstist ja arhitek-tuurist: Texte über Kunst und Architektur*, 3 vols. (Tallinn, 2000–2006).

[52] See Ene Lamp, *Ekspressionism: Eesti Kujutavas Kunstis* (Tallinn, 2004); Heie Treier, *Pärsimägi: Võrumaa—Tartu—Paris* (Tallinn, 2003).

complex task: developing an account of the artistic and architectural his-
tory of a region marked by its heterogeneity and its historical interrup-
tions, the monuments of which can only be regarded with difficulty as
comprising the historical heritage of the current Estonian state. Given the
ideological dimension of the entire project of writing a history of Estonian
art, its function as a symptom of the recent past, there is, further, the
added temptation to revert to mythic narratives of Estonian 'awakening',
of the kind that fuelled the rhetoric of nineteenth- and twentieth-century
nationalists in Central and Eastern Europe. Instead, as Kodres recognizes,
the history of art in Estonia is a history of cultural difference within a
specific geographic, cultural and politically defined space, rather than the
history of a unified nation.

The Estonian situation is paralleled by that in Lithuania; the long
period of Russian rule meant that Lithuanian art struggled to maintain a
separate identity. The most famous Lithuanian artist, Mikalojus Čiurlionis
(1875–1911), justifiably promoted as an internationally recognized figure,
was, within his lifetime, regarded as a Russian artist. As George Kenn-
away notes, the first monograph on Čiurlionis was published in Russian,
and when his work was included in the 'Second Exhibition of Post-
Impressionist Art' in London in 1912, it was again as a Russian artist that
he was included.[53] Only with the creation of the Lithuanian state was he
retrospectively pressed into service as a canonical figure in the history of
Lithuanian modernism.

Unlike Estonia, however, Lithuania was a medieval duchy with an
independent existence until the sixteenth century, and although it was
the junior partner, it then formed part of a major political entity—the
Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth—that lasted until the end of the
1700s. It thus had a distinctive artistic and cultural identity and tradition
to which it could refer. However, the vicissitudes of its history also pose
substantial problems for histories of Lithuanian art, as demonstrated in a
recent *History of Lithuanian Art*.[54] Its strategy is to present Lithuanian art
as completely rooted in European art history, and consequently, in con-
trast to the Czech example discussed above, constant reference is made
to milestones of European art, ranging from the Venus of Willendorf, to
Michelangelo's David or the Eiffel Tower. At times these are somewhat

---

[53] George Kennaway, 'Lithuanian Art and Music Abroad: English Reception of the Work
of M.K. Čiurlionis, 1912–39', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 83.2 (2005) 234–53.
[54] Aleksandra Aleksandravičiūtė, *Lietuvos Dailės Istorija* (Vilnius, 2002).

incongruous examples that display no evident affinity with Lithuanian art-works examined, but the general point is made clear: Lithuania was just as much a part of the mainstream of European art as anywhere else. In many respects this is unarguable; in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, for example, Vilnius and Kaunas were clearly within the orbit of Northern European artistic culture, with a number of significant late-Gothic structures, such as the Church of Saints Anna and Bernard in Vilnius. In the sixteenth century Italian artists and architects made a visible impact; Giovanni Maria Bernardoni (1541–1605) was active there, designing the Jesuit Academy in Vilnius, while Giovanni Cini worked on the reconstruction of the cathedral of Vilnius in the 1540s. Yet in order to sustain the argument, wider social and political realities are absent; Vilnius was, for most of its history, a Jewish and Polish, as well as Lithuanian city, and the history of art in Lithuania was intimately bound up with that of Poland. A significant number of artists mentioned in the book are of Polish origin, for example, and the presence of Italian architects in Vilnius was part of a much wider phenomenon throughout Poland-Lithuania, with parallels in, for example, Cracow or Zamość. This of course highlights the weaknesses of a project that limits itself to monuments located in the territory of the present-day Lithuanian state, when clearly they were part of a much larger cultural space that could be termed 'Lithuanian'. This stands in contrast to Poland, for example, in which a substantial amount of research has recently been undertaken on the art history of Ukraine or Belarus, formerly lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.[55] The projection onto the past of the current Lithuanian state as a framework thus creates inconsistencies and contradictions.

Indeed, this becomes clear in the structure of the work. Approximately half of the book is dedicated to the period from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. At this point the wider European compass almost entirely vanishes, and the reader is thrown into a narrowly national reading that focuses on the canon of Lithuanian national artists, such as Čiurlionis or Juozas Mikėnas (1901–1964). The examples indicate the existence of a distinctive Lithuanian modernism, but the abrupt change in tone, which alludes to but does not address directly the massive cultural and social

---

[55] The University of Cracow, for example, publishes a series of volumes on artistic monuments of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth under the title of *Pracowni Badań nad Sztuką Ziem Wschodnich Dawnej Rzeczypospolitej* (Working Studies on the Art of the Eastern Lands of the Former Republic).

interruptions that mark the history of Lithuania, throws up a series of unanswered questions.

Conclusion

A central theme within national histories is the construction of narratives that create the impression of a continuous tradition. These help preserve the sense of the nation as a stable, enduring, vehicle of cultural, social and political identity. Yet it is widely acknowledged that this is achieved by a reduction in the complexity of historical circumstances; in its most extreme forms this was attained by a deliberately politically skewed reading of history. The reconfiguring of social and political conditions that was set in motion in 1989, and which has gained pace through the rapid processes of globalization, demanded convincing historical narratives that might underpin the refashioned identities of the past twenty or so years, as new states have come into being and existing ones have been thrown into new social, economic and political situations. Art historians have played an important role in this process; as the examples discussed indicate, the challenge remains as to how to do so without either falling back onto old national myths or creating new ones.

PART TWO

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE DISCIPLINE

CULTURES OF INTERRUPTION. ART HISTORY IN THE BALTIC STATES: ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA

Krista Kodres, Giedrė Mickūnaitė and Stella Pelše

Since 1990–91, when the Baltic countries regained their independence, each of the Baltic States has undertaken a number of political, cultural, and educational reforms. In 2004, all three joined the European Union, thus approving and implementing the strategies and regulations of the EU. The context of these changes was in many ways determined by the history of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—primarily the Soviet period, which they shared in the twentieth century. The writing of art history has not only been dependent on these transformations, but also played a part in them. This chapter will explore that context as well as describe the current state of the field.

To begin with, it must be restated that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as the Baltic countries are largely a twentieth-century construct, which emerged because all three became independent nation states after the 1914–18 war and became fixed after 1945 when the three countries were occupied and incorporated into the Soviet Union as the Soviet (Baltic) Republics.[1]

As neighbours, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania naturally had constant contacts in their earlier history as well: in the Middle Ages, for example, during the colonization of the Baltic Sea by German settlers, Estonia and Latvia together formed the territory of Livonia, ruled by the Teutonic Order and partly by the Roman Pope via his bishops. Lithuania established its statehood in the mid-thirteenth century and in 1387 adopted Catholicism. During the pagan period, the elites of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were very close to Orthodox culture, which was gradually expelled as the country became attached to Poland. In the early modern period, the local cultures were confessionally divided: Estonia and Latvia became primarily Lutheran, whereas Lithuania remained Catholic. Unlike Lithuanians, Estonians and Latvians have never had their own historical aristocratic culture, as this was the field of the colonizers.

---

[1] Historically, the name 'Baltic' goes back to the eleventh century, to the *Mare balticum* by Adam of Bremen.

The colonial past also influenced the aims and value judgements of all history writing in the states; a general conclusion would be that by the twenty-first century art history in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had passed through periods of colonization, nationalism, Sovietization, and re-nationalization. The local situation has been aptly described therefore by reference to the notion of 'cultures of disruption'.[2] The master narratives of art history within each period were thus also dominated by a specific ideological discourse, and the radical twists and turns of history in each subsequent period were prompted by a certain conceptual opposition to earlier art-history writing. On the other hand, such opposition was never *too* radical, because art history in the Baltic countries has never shown a strong inclination towards theorizing.[3] Instead, its aim has always been to write the positive history of art based on works of art and written sources 'as it really happened'.

Like much of Europe, interest in local arts emerged in the Baltic countries during the Enlightenment and intellectuals educated in German universities wrote the first reviews on this topic in the nineteenth century. Although all three countries were part of the Russian Empire in that period, the attitude towards art and its history differed. Estonia and Latvia share the most productive researcher of the time, Wilhelm Neumann, the director of the Riga Art Museum, a prolific architect, and an enthusiast for national heritage. Neumann—and other Baltic Germans, such as Gotthard von Hansen, Carl Löwis of Menar, or Wilhelm Bockslaff —considered the art of Estonia and Latvia as Baltic: it was regarded as peripheral and regional, without aesthetically challenging, truly great masterpieces.[4] Nevertheless, historical art and architecture had to be catalogued, systematized, preserved, collected, and of course produced, because this was believed to be part of the way of life of a civilized nation. Thus in the early twentieth century, for instance, the Baltic German nobility in Estonia possessed some 150 art collections of various sizes.

In Lithuania, the discipline followed a slightly different path. Certain subjects in art history and aesthetics were taught at the Faculty of Arts in

---

[2] The notion was used to describe Estonian culture of the twentieth century: Hasso Krull, *Katkestuse kultuur* (Tallinn, 1996).

[3] However, the very first 'art theorist' in Estonia should be mentioned here: Karl Morgenstern, a professor at the University of Tartu (Dorpat), who wrote the *Grundriss einer Einleitung zur Ästhetik mit Andeutungen zur Geschichte derselben* (Dorpat, 1815).

[4] Wilhelm Neumann, 'Baltische Kunstzustände 1775–1825', in *Eesti Kirjameeste Seltsi aastaraamat 1881*, ed. Mihkel Veske (Tartu, 1881) 281–92; Wilhelm Neumann, *Grundriss einer Geschichte der bildenden Künste und des Kunstgewerbes in Liv-, Est- und Kurland vom Ende des 12. bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Reval, 1887).

Vilnius University, but as the university was closed down in the aftermath of the anti-tsarist uprising of 1831; interest in the arts and their history was left to amateurs. The nobility not only collected artworks and undertook archaeological excavations, but also published albums reproducing national art and sites of its historical heritage. As a result of these initiatives the Museum of Antiquities was opened in Vilnius in 1856, exhibiting examples of local art together with other artistic and historical curiosities. After 1905, the Romanov regime became more liberal and hence cultural life more intense and increasingly polarized on national grounds. Artists, too, embarked on a quest for national art. In the Lithuanian case, the oeuvre of Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis (1875–1911) came to be acknowledged as being an important representative of Lithuanian identity.

The First Independence Period: Constructing an Art-Historical Identity

In 1918, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania stood on the threshold of building an identity as newly formed nation-states, and the integration of European and national culture was the guiding slogan in this process. At a time when contemporary artists had already been working to the same rhythm as the rest of Europe for quite a while, an art-historical vocabulary was practically non-existent, as was any tradition of academic research. The task of shaping this was left to the universities, art museums, and enthusiasts of national culture.

The formation of new institutions also played a key role. In Estonia the Tallinn Art Museum was founded, based on collections from the Estonian Provincial Museum (1864–1918).[5] These holdings were supplemented with artworks that the departing Baltic Germans were not allowed to take with them because they were considered a part of the Estonian national cultural heritage.[6] In the 1920s, the Museum received new works from the State Treasury that were bought cheaply from post-revolutionary Russia.[7] The Art Museum was installed in the Kadriorg Palace built by Peter the Great; the 1937 competition for the new museum building took place

---

[5] Gotthard von Hansen, *Die Sammlungen inländischer Alterthümer und anderer auf die baltischen Provinzen bezüglichen Gegenstände des Estländischen Provinzial-Museums* (Reval, 1875).

[6] Õie Utter, 'Reinhold von Lipharti annetatud kunstikogu üleandmine Tartu Ülikoolile', *Tartu Ülikooli ajaloo küsimusi* 7 (BA Thesis, Estonian Art Academy, Tartu, 1979) 126–33.

[7] Ulla Ploom, *Eesti Kunstimuuseum ja selle varad aastatel 1919–1940* (BA Thesis, Estonian Art Academy, Tallinn, 1998); Mare Rätsep, *Kunstikogude saatusest Eestis aastatel 1920–1940* (BA Thesis, University of Tartu, 1996).

but it never materialized. The Estonian National Museum, established in 1909, also had art collections, as did the University of Tartu since 1803. Due to the war, part of the University collection was evacuated in 1915 to Voronezh in Russia, and Estonia has not yet managed to get it back.[8] In addition to these historical museums, two were founded for the display of modern art: the Art Hall, built in Tallinn in 1936, and Tartu Art Museum in 1940.

The beginnings of art museums in Latvia date back to the eighteenth century when the collection of Nicolaus Himsel (1729–1764), a doctor based in Riga, was exhibited publicly for the first time. Numerous private contributions, mainly of paintings, prints, and other Western European artefacts, laid the foundations for the City Art Gallery that was established in Riga in 1868. In 1905, the Riga City Art Museum was opened; Wilhelm Neumann was the architect of the building (today, it houses the National Museum of Art) as well as the museum director right up to 1919. The prominent Latvian landscapist Vilhelms Purvītis headed the Museum in the interwar period when a substantial collection of national art was assembled: about 900 artworks by Latvian artists were bought until 1940. The State Museum of Fine Arts was established on the premises of Riga Castle in 1920; it collected both Latvian and non-Latvian art; indeed, its most substantial acquisition in the 1930s was a comprehensive collection of early twentieth-century Belgian art.

The building of the Republic of Lithuania was challenged by the loss of Vilnius in 1919; occupied by the Polish Army, the entire Vilnius region was attached to the Republic of Poland. Not only the re-opened university, but also major museum collections remained in Poland and new institutions had to be organized in Kaunas, which was declared the temporary capital of the new state. The annexation of Vilnius resulted in a profound antagonism in Lithuania towards everything Polish, and language was adopted as a central indicator of national identity. Thus, art historians, or more precisely, educated patriots of national culture, were much more preoccupied with building a vision of 'Lithuanian-speaking' art than with relating the newly founded state to its historic predecessor, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which had for many centuries been part of a joint Commonwealth with Poland. Naturally, only popular (i.e. vernacular), hence largely anonymous, art raised no doubts concerning their

---

[8] Inge Kukk, Laidi Laiverik, Ingrid Sahk, Jaanika Tiisvend, and Külli Valk, eds., *200 years of the Art Museum of the University of Tartu* (Tartu, 2006).

'Lithuanian-ness'. Scholars, students, and amateurs embarked on expeditions exploring and collecting such popular artefacts. The poor museum situation (Vilnius collections and institutions being then in Poland) began to improve as the graphic artist Paulius Galaunė (1890–1988), after a year's training at the Louvre, was appointed director of the Čiurlionis Art Gallery in Kaunas. He played a fundamental role in developing the museum's collection, in presenting Lithuanian art internationally, and in undertaking systematic research into the vernacular arts.[9] In addition, Galaunė led negotiations concerning the restitution of Lithuania's heritage which had been removed to Russia between 1795–1918; however, these initiatives saw no success. Even though collecting centred on the vernacular or on modernist culture, some exceptions were also made to accommodate the arts of the earlier periods. The two sources that such works came from were the galleries and collections of manor houses and the Catholic Church. The manorial pieces went to the Čiurlionis Art Gallery as well as the Aušra Museum in the town of Šiauliai and the Samogitian Museum 'Alka' in the town of Telšiai. Religious art was exhibited at the Museum of Church Art that opened in Kaunas in 1935 under the direction of the painter and art critic Adolfas Valeška (1905–1994).

Regarding the academic situation, the main problem of the 1920s was the shortage of competence. In Estonia, after Tartu University was reopened in 1919 as an Estonian-language institution, Josef Strzygowski from Vienna was elected the first art history professor in 1922. He turned the post down and the Swede Helge Kjellin (1922–24, Riga University 1929–31) was employed instead. In 1933–40, the chair was held by Sten Karling.[10] A special department, the *Kunsthistorisches Kabinet*, was established for enhancing the library and assembling visual materials relating to Estonian art history.[11] Making inventory lists was also part of the study programme, greatly helping the National Heritage Board that was involved in a similar task. Teaching at Tartu was initially in German, but in the second half of the 1930s Estonian took over. The first Estonian graduates of Tartu issued

---

[9] See, for example, Paulius Galaunė, *L'art lithuanien: Un recueil d'images avec une introduction*, ed. by John Kroon (Malmö, 1934); Galaunė, *Lietuvių liaudies menas, jo meninių formų plėtojimosi pagrindai* (Kaunas, 1930; reprint Vilnius, 1988).

[10] On Sten Karling see Krista Kodres, Juhan Maiste, Vappu Vabar, eds., *Sten Karling and Baltic Art History* (Tallinn, 1999).

[11] Mart Eller, 'Tartu Ülikooli osast Eesti kunstiteaduses 1920–30-ndail aastail', *Kunstiteadus, kunstikriitika* 5, 6 (Tallinn, 1983, 1986) 60–75.

a booklet in 1927 on art historical terminology, a clear indication that in Estonian most terms were missing at that time.

In contrast to Estonia, neither in Latvia, nor in Lithuania was art history established as an academic study programme. The entire field was still conceived as background knowledge for the students of fine arts and the humanities. The first professional art historians active in Latvia had obtained an academic education either in Russia or in Western Europe. The most prominent was Boriss Vipers (also Boris Vipper, 1888–1967), a Russian-born art historian, educated at Moscow University, and drawn to Heinrich Wölfflin's formalist approach. Living and working in Riga (1924–41), he was first associate and then full professor of art history at the Latvian Academy of Art and the University of Latvia. The second major figure of the interwar period and beyond was the art historian and painter Jānis Siliņš (1896–1991), who also studied art history and theory as well as painting in Moscow and Kazan. In 1929, he graduated from the University of Latvia with a dissertation on Kant's theory of space and time and became Vipers's colleague at the Latvian Academy of Art (1933–40 and 1941–44).

The essential conceptual problem of the 1920s and 1930s was the issue of national art-historical identity. In Estonia the first volume of the *History of Estonian Art* (covering the Middle Ages) was published in 1932, which claimed that everything created on the territory of Estonia should be considered a part of 'Estonian art history'.[12] Despite its national motivation, it was still deemed necessary to retain the wider notion of 'Baltic art' to denote the earliest era of 'Estonian art history', and this was also supported by the Tartu-based art historian Voldemar Vaga in his 1940–41 survey work *Estonian Art. History of the Arts in Estonia from the Middle Ages until Today*.[13]

A significant conceptual notion in Estonian art history writing in the 1930s was that of the 'Baltic-Nordic artistic region', introduced in the writings on the geography of art ('Kunstgeographie') of the Swede Johnny Roosvall.[14] It was meant to compete with the ideas of German art historians such as Wilhelm Pinder, who regarded Baltic art as a product of German artistic impulses. The concept of a regional art landscape

---

[12] Alfred Vaga, *Eesti kunsti ajalugu: Esimene osa: Keskaeg* (Tartu, 1932) 5; Krista Kodres, 'How to Write Art History: the Estonian Experience', *Acta Historiae Artium Balticae* 1 (2005) 5–13; Krista Kodres, 'Our Own Estonian Art History: Changing Geographies of Art-Historical Narrative', *Kunstiteaduslikke Uurimusi/Studies on Art and Architecture*. Special Issue: 'The Geographies of Art History in the Baltic Region', ed. by Katrin Kivimaa 19/3–4 (2010) 11–25.

[13] Voldemar Vaga, *Eesti kunst: Kunstide ajalugu Eestis keskajast meie päevini* (Tartu, 1940–41).

[14] Johnny Roosvall, *Den baltiska Nordens kyrkor* (Uppsala, 1924).

('Kunstlandschaft') as an influential factor of art production had been raised by Josef Strzygowski, who understood it in both temporal-spatial and ethnically-demographic terms.[15] The research focus on regional artistic landscape was based on the comparative study of regional artistic monuments, and drew the particular attention of Sten Karling, the most outstanding art historian operating in Estonia in the interwar period.[16] In attempting to define the character of art Karling drew on the ideas of the Vienna School, particularly those of Alois Riegl and Max Dvořák. Consequently, for Karling art was born out of a period's artistic aspirations and expressed the spirit of its time, this spirit in turn found its own style, cultivated by the representatives of various generations (an idea he borrowed from Wilhelm Pinder).[17] Although he established this methodological and conceptual frame, Karling did not engage in any further extended theoretical reflection.[18] Other art historians working during the Republic of Estonia were also primarily concerned with collecting and arranging artefacts and works of art. The assembled data were presented in accordance with an art-historical canon that, on the one hand, relied on the system of period styles and, on the other, on the comparative-formal method.

In Latvia the aspiration to inscribe Latvian art in the wider processes of artistic developments was the central concern in the 1920s and 1930s. Vipers's wide range of interests led to the publication of a monograph on Giotto, work on the first Latvian modernist painter Jāzeps Grosvalds, a short survey of Latvian art, as well as theoretical reflections on artistic values.[19] He was also interested in the idea of stylistic evolution as a sign

---

[15] On the origins of 'Kunstgeographie' see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art* (Princeton, NJ, 2004).

[16] Among Karling's studies are: *Narva. Eine baugeschichtliche Untersuchung* (1936); *Die Marienkapelle an der Olaikirche in Tallinn und ihr Bildwerk. Ein Beitrag zur Brabenderfrage* (1937); *Arent Passer. Lisand Tallinna kunstiajaloole* (1938); *Jacob och Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie som byggherrar i Estland* (1938); *Gotland och Estlands medeltida byggnadskonst* (1939); *Riga Domkyrka och mästaren fran Köln* (1942). Until the end of Second World War Karling published altogether about 50 articles on Estonian art and architecture. Beside the academic research he actively published on Estonian contemporary art life and introduced himself as an art critic writing on Adamson-Eric, Hando Mugasto, and Arkadio Laigo. Estonian art and architecture remained Sten Karling's interest also in Sweden. In 1946, the manuscript *Medeltida träskulptur i Estland* was ready and in 1948, *Balticum och Sverige* was published in Stockholm. A short version of his study on Tallinn/Reval art history appeared in *Svio-Estonica* in 1970.

[17] See Wilhelm Pinder, *Das Problem der Generation in der Kunstgeschichte Europas* (Berlin, 1926).

[18] Krista Kodres, 'Freedom from Theory? An Attempt to Analyse Sten Karling's views on (Estonian) Art History', *Journal of Art Historiography* 3 (2010) 1–17.

[19] Boriss Vipers, *Džoto* (Riga, 1938); Vipers, *Jāzeps Grosvalds* (Riga, 1938); Vipers, *Latvju māksla* (Riga, 1927); Vipers, *L'art Letton. Essai de synthèse historique* (Riga, 1940); Vipers, *Mākslas likteņi un vērtības* (Riga, 1940).

of different conceptions of space (in this he was influenced by the Austrian art historian Dagobert Frey) as well as the theory of rusticalization popular in the 1930s. Vipers's study of Baroque art in Latvia coincided with the topical tendency to extol national, folklore-based traditions and diversify influences, diminishing the role of the high culture brought by the Teutonic Knights in the thirteenth century.[20] The most evident influence upon his colleague at the Academy, Jānis Siliņš, was Wilhelm Pinder's theory of artistic generations, and Siliņš largely structured his understanding of the Latvian art scene according to the 'common spiritual aims' of each generation, which he saw as the result of the changing forms of artistic vision. However, he interpreted the succession of generations not simply as one of stylistically consistent cycles, he also emphasized psychological differences between generations.

Kristaps Eliass (1886–1963) could be regarded as the third most important figure of the period in Latvia. Involved in the revolutionary events of 1905, he fled Tsarist persecution and travelled to Western Europe studying art history at Brussels University (1909–14). The German art historians Richard Muther and Julius Meier-Graefe were of particular importance in shaping his conceptions of artistic evolution, and in addition, he drew upon the ideas of Alois Riegl, Wilhelm Worringer, and Hermann von Helmholtz to counter deep-seated naturalist attitudes, against which he aimed to balance the roles of the self-expressive artist and the progressive spirit of the epoch culminating in the Marxist class struggle.

A joint project of general art history from prehistoric times to the present was also carried out in the interwar period involving art historians, architects, and artists.[21] The division into periods was based on both chronological and stylistic principles, and Latvia and the neighbouring Baltic States were included as equal to 'older' cultures; the volumes conceived of the artwork as a fusion of the artist's individual style, the style of the epoch and the style typical of the nation.

In Lithuania, academic interest in art history was initially centred on Kaunas Art School, the director of which was the painter Justinas Vienožinskis (1886–1960).[22] In the 1930s, the discipline received more esteem as several scholars joined the faculty of the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas. These included the Russian émigré Lev Karsavin

---

[20] Boriss Vipers, *Baroque Art in Latvia* (Riga, 1939).

[21] Vilhelms Purvītis, ed., *Mākslas vēsture*, 3 vols. (Riga, 1934–36).

[22] Dalia Ramonienė, *Justinas Vienožinskis* (Vilnius, 2004).

(1882–1952) who contributed towards the broader perspective on the cultural history of Europe.[23] Jurgis Baltrušaitis (1903–1988), a student of Henri Focillon, initiated the writing of the very first universal history of art in the Lithuanian language and authored its first two volumes dealing with the ancient and medieval world.[24] Significant research was also undertaken by those who studied abroad, In 1926, Halina Kairiūkštytė-Jacynienė (1896–1984) received her doctorate from the University of Zurich for her dissertation on the Camaldulese monastery in Pažaislis.[25] Her thesis placed this example of baroque art in an international context and abandoned the question of national art altogether. Mikalojus Vorobjovas (1903–1954) defended a dissertation on the oeuvre of Mikalojus Konstaninas Čiurlionis (1875–1911) at the University of Munich in 1933.[26]

The discipline gained its social prestige not from academia, but from the wider cultural press. On the pages of the monthly *Naujoji Romuva* (1931–40) the magazine's editor-in-chief and *spiritus movens* Juozas Keliuotis (1902–1983) formulated the ideology of Lithuanian culture as the unity of rustic spirit and the constantly renewing forms of modernism.[27] Thus, with a severe lack of examples of historic artworks, art history functioned as a combination of visual ethnology, art criticism, and theory. Politics motivated scholarly agendas. During the two decades that Lithuania was deprived of her historical capital the city's historical sites continued to play a prominent role. Vilnius was regained in 1939, which satisfied national longing, although an art-historical appreciation of the cityscapes and individual buildings regardless of their 'national identity' was evident in Mikalojus Vorobjovas's study *The Art of Vilnius* published in 1940.[28]

Soviet Manipulations

The Second World War was tragic for the Baltic countries because in addition to losing national independence, they also lost a considerable part of their intelligentsia. Regarding art historians, besides Sten Karling, Estonia

---

[23] Levas Karsavinas, *Europos kultūros istorija*, 5 vols. (Kaunas, 1931–36).
[24] Jurgis Baltrušaitis, *Visuotinė meno istorija*, 2 vols. (Kaunas, 1934–39).
[25] Halina Kairiūkštytė-Jacynienė, *Pažaislis, Ein Barockkloster in Litauen* (Kaunas, 1930).
[26] Nikolai Worobiow, *M. K. Čiurlionis: Litauischer Maler und Musiker* (Kaunas and Leipzig, 1938).
[27] Juozas Keliuotis, *Meno tragizmas: Studija ir straipsniai apie literatūrą ir meną* (Vilnius, 1997). Also see: Jolita Mulevičiūtė, ed. *Modernity and Identity: Art in 1918–1940* (Vilnius, 2000) 7–93.
[28] Mikalojus Vorobjovas, *Vilniaus menas* (Kaunas, 1940; reprint 1997).

lost Armin Tuulse (1907–1977), who went on to become professor of art history at Stockholm University from 1962 to 1974. Latvia lost Jānis Siliņš, who defended his thesis in Latvia in 1943 on August Schmarsow, but later emigrated to the United States, where he published a historical survey of Latvian art in five volumes.[29] In 1944, Mikalojus Vorobjovas, Justinas Vienožinskis, and Adolfas Valeška left Lithuania for the West, while Lev Karsavin was deported to Komi in 1949.

Those who stayed at home had to adjust to the Soviet interpretation of Marxist cultural theory. The intellectuals were divided into two groups: the Soviets and the 'bourgeois nationalists'. Of the latter, many were deported to Siberia and those who escaped this fate, had to master Soviet rhetoric quickly. History was rewritten, the 'errors' of the past were considered regrettable and articles appeared under the titles such as 'Against Bourgeois Remnants in Art History'.[30] Everything published in the Soviet era was first subjected to censorship. The Soviet occupation tried to refocus all the humanities into a propaganda tool. What is more, libraries also came under scrutiny in the 1940s and 'suspicious' publications were moved to special storage that could be accessed only with personal permits. For example, after the 'cleansing' of the library of the art history department at Tartu University, 557 publications, including such works as Anton Springer's general art history, were sequestered.[31] Even more tragic was the fact that throughout the Soviet era no books were bought from the West; academic libraries were only supplemented with publications from the Soviet Union or other socialist countries. University teaching continued in the mother tongue in all three Baltic countries while in other Soviet national republics it was possible to study only in Russian. Between 1948 and 1989, art history in Estonia was taught only at Tartu University, where 186 students specializing in art history received their diplomas.[32] Later the two academic degrees that is, candidate of sciences and doctor of sciences were only permitted to be defended in large Soviet centres, such as Moscow or Leningrad, and in Russian only. By the

---

[29] Jānis Siliņš, *Latvijas māksla 1800–1914*, 2 vols. (Stockholm, 1979–80); Siliņš, *Latvijas māksla 1915–1940*, 3 vols. (Stockholm, 1988–93).

[30] Voldemar Vaga, 'Kodanlike igandite vastu kunstiajaloos', *Rahva Hääl*, 14 June 2006.

[31] Mari Nõmmela, *Voldemar Vaga (1899–1999) ja eesti kunsti ajalugu* (Tartu, 2008) 106.

[32] Between 1964 and 1975, thirteen art history candidate degrees were defended at Tartu; a degree paper was a monograph of 200–250 pages and this preceded the doctorate (approx. 500 pages), see Nõmmela, *Voldemar Vaga*, 194.

end of the Soviet period, five more Estonians had defended their candidate degree in art history.

In Latvia, the situation regarding teaching and research was even more complicated. In the late 1940s, an art history department was briefly established at the Faculty of Philology of the University of Latvia. As ideological demands had increased the role of theoretical disciplines at the Latvian Academy of Art, a part-time (external) Department of Art History and Theory was opened there in 1959 and a full-time Department was added in 1970.[33]

In 1945, an Art History Department was established on the remains of its namesake at the Stefan Batory University at the State Art Institute of the Lithuanian SSR (today, the Vilnius Academy of Arts).[34] The department's function was to provide an art-historical education for future artists and architects. By the 1950s, most of the faculty members were either forced to leave the institution (all the Polish faculty left for Poland in 1946) or were deported and it was not for another decade that the department started functioning more evenly. From 1959, extramural studies in art history were offered and from 1969, students started to enrol in a full-time programme.[35] In addition to teaching (curricula were received from Moscow and then adapted locally) research was undertaken, the results of which started being published in the specialized art-historical quarterly *Menotyra* established in 1967.[36]

Alongside the universities, research was carried out in the three Soviet Baltic Republics at the institutes of the Academy of Sciences: Estonia had an Institute of History (1947), with its Art History Department; in Latvia the Department of Art History was opened by the Institute of Language and Literature (1968); and in Lithuania at the Institute of History

---

[33] Some 216 students received their diplomas in art history between 1965 and 1989 and 11 defended their degrees either in Moscow or Leningrad during the Soviet period. In the early 1990s, degrees were recognized as the equivalent of a doctorate in arts.

[34] For the activities of this department see: Józef Poklewski, 'Katedra Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Stefana Batorego w Wilnie 1922–1939', in *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce: ksztaltowanie się instytucji naukowych w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. Adam S. Labuda (Poznań, 1996) 203–12.

[35] By the end of the Soviet epoch, 239 diplomas in art history were granted. Some of the art history graduates continued their studies ending with dissertations that at the turn of the 1960s could be defended in Vilnius (three dissertations) while later on either in Moscow or in Leningrad (fourteen dissertations).

[36] *Menotyra: LTSR Aukštųjų mokyklų mokslo darbai* (1967–1993), published since 1994 as *Menotyra*.

(1958–87). Many art historians also worked in state heritage research and design institutes.

Soviet Art Histories

Following the establishment of the Soviet regime, the publication of new histories of art and architecture was the major task for art historians in the Baltic Republics. Due to the theoretical frames that were imposed, this caused considerable difficulties. Estonia and Latvia faced the fundamental problem of 'how to solve the issue of the so-called Baltic art'.[37] Publications had to minimize the historic role of the Baltic Germans and emphasize the part of local people and the Russians in producing the arts of the past. Only in the 1970s was it finally permitted to publish research on nineteenth-century Baltic German art.[38] The 'Baltic issue' was beginning to lose its ideological topicality, as the compiling of inventories and listing of historical (German-owned) manor houses that quietly started to take place in the 1970s indicates. Still, although direct ideological pressure on art-history writing diminished in the 1970s and 1980s, self-censorship nevertheless operated on an institutional and personal level, and this ensured that texts adhered to a more or less 'correct' ideological frame.

Generally speaking, Baltic art historians continued to write according to the canon fixed in the 1930s: the main task was to carefully describe the material and place it within the correct style period. In this way, many new artworks and data were brought to light.[39] Another important task was to establish, by the comparative method, 'genealogical' connections between art forms of the relevant period in the region. There was little theological-iconographical analysis of, for example, Christian art, because there were no contemporary reference books, and on the other hand, the iconographical-iconological analysis could have revealed meanings that were alien to Marxist views. The concept of art as the 'reflection of the era' did not vanish either, although the understanding of the *Zeitgeist* was

---

[37] Nõmmela, *Voldemar Vaga*, 109.

[38] Voldemar Vaga, *Kunst Tallinnas XIX sajandil* (Tallinn, 1971); Voldemar Vaga, *Kunst Tartus XIX sajandil* (Tallinn, 1971).

[39] In Estonia, some of these materials were published only after the turn: Villem Raam, ed., *Eesti Arhitektuuri Leksikon*, 4 vols. (Tallinn, 1993–1999); Mart-Ivo Eller, ed., *Eesti kunsti ja arhitektuuri biograafiline leksikon* (Tallinn, 1996). In Lithuania, the most comprehensive result of this research is the first (and only) volume of the *Catalogue of Cultural and Historical Monuments of the Lithuanian SSR* dedicated to the city of Vilnius: *Lietuvos TSR istorijos ir kultūros paminklų sąvadas, Vilnius* (Vilnius, 1988).

now determined by the obligatory Soviet-Marxist scheme, and descriptions of historical contexts and the connections with art production, including artistic relations with the ruling class ideology, usually accompanied the text on style and its history. Certain topics, especially those dominant in the country's culture, were not to be treated in-depth. For example, in Latvia and Estonia the arts of the Lutheran Church were deemed ideologically suspicious and were totally absent until the late 1980s, while in Lithuania, Protestant culture was regarded quite favourably, but everything related to Catholic heritage underwent a heightened censorship. In a paradoxical and conservative manner, the artist was often surrounded by a romantic aura.

New general surveys of local art history were published during the 1960s and 1970s. In Estonia, the *History of Estonian Architecture* appeared in 1965 and soon after the two-volume *History of Estonian Art* followed.[40] The first was structured according to Marxist principles of periodization (e.g. the 'Feudal Period'), the content of the latter followed the canonical division into stylistic periods. Generally, in the field of research, the safe and distant topics of the Middle Ages seemed to prevail and great attention was naturally paid to Soviet Estonian art.[41] The question of the history of so-called national art was ambiguous, too, but it was possible to address it by limiting the narrative to biographic and aesthetic analysis.[42] Contemporary modernist art had to be interpreted with caution, although from the mid-1960s onwards, the treatment of the doctrine of Socialist Realism in the Soviet Union was revised. The theorists of that time, Boris Bernstein and Jaak Kangilaski, taught at the Tallinn State Art Institute; Bernstein published widely in the Soviet Union and in other Socialist countries.[43] Bernstein's structuralist theory of 'art culture' was, however, hardly integrated into the analysis of local art history. One of the most significant centres of research was the Moscow-Tartu School of Semiotics; Yuri Lotman worked at the University of Tartu, although his texts only became more widely known among art historians in the 1980s. Finally in 1991, Lotman's *Cultural Semiotics* was translated into Estonian.

---

[40] Harald Arman, ed., *Eesti arhitektuuri ajalugu* (Tallinn, 1965); Irina Solomõkova, ed., *Eesti kunsti ajalugu kahes köites* (Tallinn, 1970–1977). An academic journal, *Studies in Art History*, was established in 1976 for the publication of work on special research topics.

[41] Villem Raam, *Gooti puuskulptuur Eestis* (Tallinn, 1976); Mai Lumiste, *Tallinna Surmatants* (Tallinn, 1976); Rein Zobel, *Tallinna keskaegsed kindlustused* (Tallinn, 1980); Kalvi Aluve, *Kuressaare linnus* (Tallinn, 1980).

[42] Helmi Üprus, *Päikesemängud* (Tallinn, 1976); Voldemar Erm, *Lähtemeistrid* (Tallinn, 1984); Irina Solomõkova, *Hando Mugasto* (1907–37) (Tallinn, 1984).

[43] See Boris Bernstein, *Kunstiteadus ja kunstikultuur* (Tallinn, 1990).

In Latvia, Soviet-period art-historical texts were mostly concerned with sifting out the 'democratic', 'progressive', 'healthy', 'realist' tendencies (received through contacts with Russian culture even before the onset of the Socialist state) from 'decadent', 'bourgeois', 'modernist', 'formalist' trends (largely obtained from Western examples). Still, over several decades, the notion of Socialist Realism was increasingly widened; initially conceived as the complete dismissal of the past, it later became the culmination of a long-term historical development, so that each period and its achievements deserved their reasonable place within this course of evolution. In addition to the publication of a series of albums and monographs and regular editions of collected articles on Latvian art (1957–88) the most important contribution of the time remains the comprehensive volume on Latvian art written by a team of prominent art historians of the period (Dzidra Blūma, Skaidrīte Cielava, Ruta Čaupova, Veronika Kučinska, Zaiga Kuple, Rasma Lāce, Velta Lapacinska, Ināra Novadniece), and published in 1986.[44] This inclusive survey of visual and applied arts as well as architecture and stage design is still in use today, although it is full of references to Soviet ideology. The division into periods was derived from the socio-political changes either in Tsarist Russia or the USSR. Materials on other periods had been gathered as well, but the next volume, although much advanced, was never published, as the political transformations of the 1990s both undermined financial resources and made much of the interpretation obsolete. Some of the art historians' research appeared in a series of collected articles dealing with the oldest monuments and artefacts from the archaeological material to the nineteenth century, published from 1986 to 1989, and these testify to the growing interest in a purely positivistic 'fact-based' approach during the late-Soviet period.[45]

In Lithuania the major fruits of art-historical research ripened in the 1980s, when the first histories of Lithuanian art began to appear. The pioneering *History of Lithuanian Twentieth-Century Art* was followed by the *History of Lithuanian Architecture* and the *History of Art and Architecture of the Lithuanian SSR*.[46] All these studies are based on strict typologies of

---

[44] Skaidrīte Cielava, ed., *Latviešu tēlotāja māksla 1860–1940* (Riga, 1986).
[45] Skaidrīte Cielava, ed., *Materiāli feodālisma posma Latvijas mākslas vēsturei*, 4 vols. (Riga, 1986–1989).
[46] Ingrida Korsakaitė and Irena Kostkevičiūtė, eds., *XX a. Lietuvių dailės istorija*, 3 vols. (Vilnius, 1982–1990); *Lietuvos architektūros istorija*, 4 vols. (Vilnius, 1985–2000); Tadas Adomonis and Klemensas Čerbulėnas, *Lietuvos TSR dailės ir architektūros istorija*, 1, *Nuo seniausių laikų iki 1795 metų* (Vilnius, 1987).

form and genres and follow the chronology of period styles. Importantly, the last two *Histories* went beyond the country's twentieth-century borders and included artworks from the larger Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Thus, the long-ignored relation with the past began to be restored. This restoration has been largely indebted to Polish scholarship, which regarded the entire heritage of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as Polish and was available in the libraries and several bookshops of Vilnius.

The general *Histories* were complemented with studies on narrower topics, of which works by Jonas Umbrasas (1925–1988) on Lithuanian painting in the first half of the twentieth century and on Lithuanian artists' organizations of the same period had added a socio-analytical dimension to the understanding of the art world.[47] As to the heritage of the Grand Duchy, Marija Matušakaitė's monograph *The Portrait in Lithuania from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries*, a bestseller of its time, not only offered a typology of portraits, but also speculated on the genesis and function of portraiture at large.[48]

Despite the significance of these art-historical publications of the 1980s, all of them treated individual artworks in isolation. The obvious lack of theoretical perspective prompted contextual interpretations that first appeared in student diploma papers in the mid-1980s. Irena Vaišvilaitė played a decisive role in this theoretical turn as well as in the growth of interest in the Grand Duchy's heritage, which dominated scholarly agendas for the decade following the restoration of Lithuania's independence. Vaišvilaitė's *The Beginnings of Baroque Art in Lithuania*[49] analysed changes in the early modern mentality and indicates their reflections on the new art of the baroque. In parallel with the investigation of the artistic heritage of the Grand Duchy, the search for Lithuanian art outside the country resulted in research on the arts of exile. In retrospect, one may conclude that these two directions had a common denominator: the idea that there exist specific national traits in works of art that can be expressed and perceived visually.

---

[47] Jonas Umbrasas, *Lietuvių tapybos raida 1900–1940: srovės ir tendencijos* (Vilnius, 1987); Jonas Umbrasas and Eglė Kunčiuvienė, *Lietuvių dailininkų organizacijos 1900–1940* (Vilnius, 1980).

[48] Marija Matušakaitė, *Portretas XVI–XVIII a. Lietuvoje* (Vilnius, 1984). Revised and enlarged edition: *Portretas Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje* (Vilnius, 2010).

[49] Irena Vaišvilaitė, *Baroko pradžia Lietuvoje*, Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis/Vilniaus dailės akademijos darbai. Dailė 6 (Vilnius, 1995).

The 1980s were also important for the development of museums. In 1974–88, the West Berlin-based art collector Mykolas Žilinskas (1904–1992) donated 1,683 pieces of Ancient and European art to the Lithuanian Art Museum upon the condition that they be exhibited permanently in Kaunas; thus, the new Art Gallery bearing the donor's name was opened in 1989.[50]

Free Again: Institutional Reforms and Problems in Academia

The recent history of the Baltic States has been one of reforms and changes. In higher education, the Soviet-era five-year diploma course became a 4+2+4-year system in the early 1990s and the Bologna 3+2+4-year system has since been either implemented, as in Estonia, or is in the process of being introduced, as in Lithuania and Latvia. In contrast to much of Europe the Baltic countries follow the *numerus clausus*, that is, each year the State announces the required number of students in every field and level of studies. This number is smallest in Estonia—only six in recent years, and largest in Lithuania: twenty in Vilnius and forty in Kaunas. In Estonia and Lithuania, students who perform well at the entrance exams can also study art history if they are prepared to pay for it; all student fees were recently abolished in Latvia.[51] An increasing number of students use the Erasmus and DoRa programmes to study at other European universities for a semester or a year.

The transitional 1990s saw the establishment of new research and study centres and the transformation of existing ones. Before the 1990s, it was only possible to study art history in Estonia as a branch of history at the University of Tartu. The need for an independent academic curriculum led to the establishment of the Institute of Art History in Tallinn in 1992, as part of the Estonian Academy of Arts, as one of the aims was to bring art practice and art-historical research more closely together. On the basis of the experience of this arrangement many lecturers today

---

[50] *Mykolo Žilinsko dailės kolekcija / Mykolas Žilinskas' art collection: iliustruotas inventorinis katalogas*, eds. Violeta Krištopaitytė, Palmyra Sakalauskienė, Irmantė Randarčikaitė-Šarakauskienė, (Kaunas, 2006).

[51] In 2008, four art history students in Estonia enrolled for a state-funded MA programme and two were able to proceed with their PhDs. In Latvia, nine students entered the MA and ten were enrolled in the PhD programme. In Lithuania, there are ten state-funded openings for MA and three for PhD students in Vilnius, while twenty-four MA and three PhD candidates are accepted in Kaunas. Moreover, the Vilnius Gediminas Technical University accepts ten students for the MA in history and theory of architecture and around three for a PhD programme in the same field.

actually doubt whether studying art history in the environment of art, rather than of the humanities, is justified. The Institute of Art History is currently the only institution in Estonia that has internationally accredited study programmes on all three study levels and the only doctoral council in art history in Estonia. The Institute has professorships in older (i.e. pre-modern) art history, in architecture, contemporary art history, and art theory.[52] Besides the Institute, art history is still taught at the Tartu University Institute of History (one professorship) and the Institute of History of Tallinn University (one professorship), where students can specialize in their History programmes; the MA courses at the Institute of Art History and Tallinn University partly overlap.

In Latvia, the central institution of art history remains the research centre founded in 1968. On 1 June 2002, the Art History Department of the Institute of Literature, Folklore and Art (renamed in 1992) in Riga was reorganized as the Institute of Art History at the Latvian Academy of Art. The reason for this major institutional change was a general policy of integrating research institutes into the system of advanced learning. The Academy of Art was chosen as the only institution in the country that could confer degrees in the discipline.[53]

In Lithuania, in addition to the Department of Art History and Theory, the Institute of Art-Historical Research was established at the Vilnius Academy of Arts in 1994. The new Institute of Culture and Arts (today, Lithuanian Culture Research Institute) was organized, drawing upon the resources of the Academy of Sciences. The Vytautas Magnus University was reopened in Kaunas in 1989 and its Institute of Arts has become a research and study centre.[54]

Museums

Among the essential changes brought about by independence were the depoliticization of culture, and institutional autonomy. In regard to

---

[52] Since its founding the Institute has issued BA diplomas to 83, MA degrees to 39, and PhD degrees to 8 art historians. In addition, two PhDs have been defended in the semiotics of visual culture at Tartu.

[53] Between 1990 and 2008, the Art History Department of the Latvian Academy of Art issued 173 BA diplomas, conferred 91 MA degrees (including an external MA program, 1993–2003) and 7 PhD degrees (apart from the branch of Restoration recently included in the Art History Department).

[54] Since PhD programmes were established at the Vilnius Academy of Arts (in 1994) and at other institutions, more than 80 doctoral dissertations in art history had been defended by 2011.

museums, this primarily concerns the acquisitions and exhibition policy. During the Soviet period, museums were regularly compelled to buy works by officially approved artists, whereas today museums determine their own purchase policy. What has not changed is the concentration on collecting and displaying local art, although great attention is paid to the arts of exile during the Soviet period, and to the avant-garde art that was impossible to acquire back then.

As already indicated, the network of museums in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania developed predominantly during the course of the twentieth century. The major change brought by the 1990s was the increasing diversity of the art world: galleries were established, private collectors became known, and an art market slowly formed. The Art Museum of Estonia with its branches still operates in Tallinn; the Museum of Foreign Art in the Kadriorg Palace, the museum of older art in St Nicholas Church, and the museum of Adamson-Eric a remarkable Estonian artist of the twentieth century. In 2006, the first specially built art museum in Estonia—KUMU—opened in the Kadriorg Park, displaying Estonian art from the second half of the eighteenth century to the present day. The Tallinn Art Hall also possesses its own collection of contemporary art. In addition, there is the Estonian Museum of Applied Art and Design in Tallinn (founded in 1971) and the Estonian Museum of Architecture (1991). Tartu Art Museum, the art gallery of the Narva Museum, and the Pärnu Museum of contemporary art have their collections as well. Finally, in 2007, the Estonian Museum of Contemporary Art was also initiated. Several private collectors support state museums. For example, in 1994, Johannes Mikkel donated his collection of over 600 works of European and Estonian art from the sixteenth century to the present, which he assembled over fifty years, to the Art Museum of Estonia. Many donations have been made to museums by families who were forced into exile during the Second World War. A major subsidizer of the museums is the Estonian Cultural Endowment.

In Latvia, the National Museum of Art keeps the largest collection of Baltic and Latvian artworks from the eighteenth century to the present; the cabinet of the avant-garde artist Gustavs Klucis is among its most renowned exhibits. The former customs storage hall left by the Soviet Army was added in 1986 and rearranged as the Arsenāls Exhibition Hall. The Museum of Romans Suta and Aleksandra Beļcova, dedicated to these modernist artists of the 1920s and 1930s, opened in 2008 as a part of National Museum of Art. Among other major museums one should mention the Art Museum Riga Bourse (opened in 2011), the former Museum

of Foreign Art situated in Riga Castle, and the Museum of Decorative Arts
and Design (founded in 1989); both were reorganized as departments of
National Museum of Art since 2010. The most urgent problem is the short-
age of exhibition space. Large temporary exhibitions are held at the Riga
Art Space opened in the Town Hall Square underground in 2008. How-
ever, permanent exhibitions still need to be enlarged: a limited show of
Soviet-period Latvian art has been available at the Artists' Union Latvian
Museum, but contemporary art since the late 1980s (installations, ready-
mades, video art, etc.) is still inaccessible to a wider public, although the
Centre of Contemporary Art has done major work to document the scene.
The Latvian Museum of Contemporary Art was due to open in Andrejsala
near the Daugava River, where a former power plant was to be recon-
structed by the Dutch architect Rem Koolhaas's office, although the
project was halted by the financial downturn of 2008. Outside Riga, the
Rundāle Palace Museum, located in the splendid eighteenth-century pal-
ace by Francesco Bartolomeo Rastrelli, sponsors research into Latvian cul-
tural heritage, especially that related to the Baltic-German landed gentry.

In Lithuania, the major event was the transformation of the Artist
Union's Exhibition Hall into the independent Contemporary Art Centre
in 1992, and the establishment of Soros Contemporary Art Centre in 1993.[55]
The two centres were the first to introduce new curatorial practices. Art
historians interested in the contemporary art scene quickly adapted criti-
cal theories and became active critics and curators preoccupied much
more with showing rather than analysing art.[56] In parallel, a number of
art galleries opened in all major cities.

Of the exhibitions that indicated changes within the perception of
the arts of the past, *Christianity in the Art of Lithuania*, organized by the
Lithuanian Art Museum as a series of temporary shows in 1999–2003 was
decisive in bringing the long-neglected tradition of Church art into pub-
lic awareness. During these shows, the display of the treasury of Vilnius
Cathedral, discovered in 1985 during the last Soviet years, and hidden in
the museum so as not to be taken to Moscow, was a major attraction.
The liturgical items exhibited opened up the issue of the restitution of
sacred art to the Church and the establishment of the Diocese Museums
in Vilnius and in Kaunas. The political decision to create a concrete bond

---

[55] The Contemporary Art Information Centre of the Lithuanian Art Museum was
renamed the Information Centre of the National Gallery of Art in 2008.

[56] The fifteen years of the Contemporary Art Centre's activities are presented in the
catalogue Kęstutis Kuizinas and Julija Fomina, *ŠMC/CAC 1992–2007* (Vilnius, 2007).

between the country of today and the 'glorious' Grand Duchy of Lithuania challenged the entire museum situation. Following a law passed by parliament, the palace in the territory of the former Lower Castle of Vilnius is being reconstructed to house the National Museum—Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania. In addition to the polemical Palace, the National Art Gallery, exhibiting works from the beginning of the twentieth century, opened in Vilnius in 2009. The Modern Art Centre based on the Butkus family collection of Lithuanian art from the second half of the twentieth century is going to be built next to the National Art Gallery. The aim of the Centre is to exhibit artworks that could not be purchased by state museums either because of Soviet ideology or lack of funds.

New Art History?

The regaining of independence opened up new opportunities to rewrite national art histories: this aimed firstly to purify the field of the Soviet-Marxist burden, and secondly to reconsider the general methodological grounds of research and writing. The discourses of the discipline did not change immediately. The first signs emerged at the end of the 1990s, partly brought about by new opportunities for art historians to study abroad. Scholars from the Baltic countries attended the Central European University in Prague and Budapest, received Paul Getty, Humboldt and other research grants and scholarships from Scandinavian institutions, the Goethe and Herder institutes, as well as other foundations.

In the 1990s, it became clear that both history and art history required novel overviews that would incorporate the ideas of the 'turns' within the global humanities. In Estonia, these attempts were first made in the largely reference-book style *Art of the Twentieth Century*, which tried to fill the gaps in the knowledge of Western modern art.[57] Then, initially commissioned by the Finns, *A Short History of Estonian Art* was published.[58] It addressed the sensitive topic of art in Soviet Estonia, raising the issue of the relation between form and meaning; it argued, in particular, that despite the analogy of visual language, Estonian modernist and postmodernist art denoted different ideas from Western art of the same time. The prevailing ideological ambition of the arts of the Soviet period—namely, to differ from official art—was formulated clearly thus overshadowing

---

[57] Ants Juske, Jaak Kangilaski, Reet Varblane, *20. sajandi kunst* (Tallinn, 1994).
[58] Sirje Helme, Jaak Kangilaski, *Lühike Eesti kunsti ajalugu* (Tallinn, 1999).

sensitive problem of involvement with Soviet state ideology. The changes in art and writing on art after the turn were first analysed in the collection of essays entitled *Noisy Nineties. Problems, Themes and Meanings in Estonian Art on* [sic] *1990s*.[59] In 1999 the Society of Art Historians organised a first conference addressing the issues of local art historiography.[60]

  The need for a discursive change was perceived very keenly in the late 1990s.[61] The publication of the new, six-volume *History of Estonian Art*, has to be seen as a part of this 'awakening'. To date two volumes, tackling the early modern period and the period 1900–1940 have been published.[62] The sixth (1940–90) volume is due to appear shortly. The authors have been called on to avoid the pitfalls of writing an art history that would romanticize or evaluate art production on the basis of nationality or some other universal idea. In fact, in 2007 the annual meeting of the Society of Art Historians was dedicated to the issue of national discourse in art history writing. The deforming impact of national sentiment on art historical narratives was thereby addressed and critically analysed. Not every scholar shares this approach, however. The single volume *The Story of Estonian Art* by Juhan Maiste has adopted a romantic view of its subject.[63] Among the fields of study covered by contemporary Estonian art history, research into medieval and early modern culture has been concentrated at Tallinn University[64] inquiry into modernist-postmodernist art and architecture is centred at the Institute of Art History.[65] In addition, the Institute of Art History and that of Estonian Language have jointly supported research into the Semiotics of visual culture.[66] All research conspicuously focuses on Estonian material, but different questions are now being asked. In

---

[59] Sirje Helme, Johannes Saar, eds., *Noisy Nineties. Problems, Themes and Meanings in Estonian Art on 1990s* (Tallinn, 2001).

[60] Tiina Abel, Piret Lindpere, eds., *Eesti kunstiteadus ja -kriitika 20. sajandil. Eesti Kunstiakadeemia Toimetised* 9 (Tallinn, 2002).

[61] Virve Sarapik, 'Estonian Art of the 1990s and the Postsemiotic Turn', in Helme and Saar, eds., *Noisy Nineties. Problems, Themes and Meanings in Estonian Art on 1990s*, 279–313.

[62] Krista Kodres, ed., *Eesti kunsti ajalugu (History of Estonian Art) 1520–1770*, 2 (Tallinn, 2005); Mart Kalm, ed., *Eesti kunsti ajalugu (History of Estonian Art)* 5: 1900–1940 (Tallinn, 2010).

[63] Juhan Maiste, *Eesti kunsti lugu* (Tallinn, 2008).

[64] See, for example, Anu Mänd, *Urban Carnival: Festive Culture in the Hanseatic Cities of the Eastern Baltic, 1350–1550* (Turnhout, 2005).

[65] See, for example, Mart Kalm and Ingrid Ruudi, eds., *Constructed Happiness: Domestic Environment in the Cold War Era* (Tallinn, 2005).

[66] See the series of conference publications edited by Virve Sarapik, Kadri Tüür, and Mari Laanemets, *Koht ja paik: Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics* (Tallinn, 2000–2008).

addition, the scope of interests has widened and incorporates not only art but the much broader field of visual culture, research on film, photo, design and other visual phenomena.

In Latvia, the comprehensive survey of local artistic phenomena remains among the primary tasks of the discipline. Research work at the Institute of Art History is focused on various aspects of the history of Latvian architecture, art and art theory from prehistoric times to the present day. A group of art historians has recently attempted to write an up-to-date version of a short history of Latvian art based on the traditional stylistic divisions and analysis of distinct kinds of art; although much in use, it remains a cursory introduction to the subject.[67] One of the current long-term projects at the Institute of Art History concerns the history of Latvian art on the Internet. Its aim is to create a 'canon' of Latvian art, meaning not so much the catalogue of best achievements as rather the display of phenomena typical of a particular period. The main task is to provide a synthesis of previous empirical research, complement it and interpret phenomena in the context of overall development as well as to detect relationships with other regions and national schools of art.

It is possible that the largely empirical approach to art is linked to the discipline's proximity to artistic practice instead of contacts with other disciplines, such as sociology or philosophy, that might develop if art-historical research were carried out at in the university context. Also, given the prior dependence of art on political contexts, the experience of the totalitarian past also served as a kind of warning against narrow-minded, tendentious exaggerations that had become quite well-established in the late decades of the twentieth century. Hence the art historian Eduards Kļaviņš's comments that, 'in Baltic art history a now natural and, perhaps, 'healthy' chaos prevails or, let us say in order to define it positively, a kind of a very loose empirical approach when researcher [sic] uses in the stage of interpretation and exposition simple descriptive language of common vocabulary combined with eclectic terminology at hand which reflects better or worse known old and new methodological traditions'.[68]

By the later 1990s, the transformed situation produced its first results and revealed tendencies in Lithuanian scholarship. Three themes have dominated research: ecclesiastical art from the seventeenth to nineteenth

---

[67] Laila Bremša, Aija Brasliņa, Dainis Bruģis, Stella Pelše, and Inta Pujāte, *Latvijas mākslas vēsture* (Riga, 2003).

[68] Eduards Kļaviņš, 'Art History in Totalitarian Societies and its Alternative Models in a Post-totalitarian Age', *Studija: Visual Arts Magazine* 6 (1999) 101.

centuries, the modernism of the interwar period, and the art of Vilnius
before 1940. Social context has been a common denominator of all these
inquiries. In addition to the social history of art, significant attention was
paid to the registration of cultural heritage and compiling scholarly refer-
ence works.[69] Reviewing the list of books that came out in the 1990s, the
lack of studies on the arts of the Soviet period becomes apparent.[70] The
complicated relation with the Soviet past has been a natural obstacle for
research of a still living heritage. Alfonsas Andriuškevičius's article 'Semi-
nonconformist Lithuanian Painting, 1956–1986' was decisive in shaping
the view of the Soviet period in coining the term of 'semi-nonconform-
ism', still in use today.[71] Andriuškevičius has published two collections
of articles that previously appeared in the cultural press, thus offering a
certain overview of Lithuanian visual arts from 1975 to 2005.[72]

   The cultural turn has manifested itself in art history, bringing anthropo-
logical insights and a non-hierarchical approach to visual studies. Tojana
Račiūnaitė's monograph on religious experience and artistic activity of
the Discalced Carmelites legitimated this turn, not only by inquiring into
'marginalities' alongside distinguished pieces, but also by placing Carmel-
ite visual culture within the context of early modern monasticism.[73] As
to research concerned with the more recent past, several studies on the
arts of the first half of the twentieth century stand out for the novelty
of the material investigated and the depth of scrutiny: *The Art of Vilnius
in the Early Twentieth Century* by Laima Laučkaitė-Surgailienė, *Towards
Modernism* by Jolita Mulevičiūtė, and *Art and State* by Giedrė Jankevičiūtė
fall into the field of the social history of art enriched with insightful
micro-histories.[74]

---

[69] See the catalogue of Lithuania's religious art *Lietuvos sakralinės dailės katalogas*
(Vilnius, 1996–2008); the Dictionary of Lithuanian Artists: Aistė Paliušytė, ed., *Lietuvos
dailininkų žodynas. I: XVI–XVIII a.*, (Vilnius, 2005), and the very first Lithuanian dictionary
of art: Jolita Mulevičiūtė, Giedrė Jankevičiūtė, and Lijana Šatavičiūtė, eds., *Dailės žodynas*
(Vilnius, 1999).

[70] *Lietuvių dailėtyrinė knyga 1990–2000* (Vilnius, 2000).

[71] Alfonsas Andriuškevičius, 'Seminonkoformistinė lietuvių tapyba: 1956–1986', *Kultūros
barai* 12 (1992) 15–19; an English version was published in: Alla Rosenfelt and Norton T.
Dodge, eds., *From Gulag to Glasnost: Nonconformist Art from the Soviet Union* (New York
and London, 1995) 218–26.

[72] Alfonsas Andriuškevičius, *Lietuvių dailė: 1975–1995* (Vilnius, 1997) and Alfonsas
Andriuškevičius, *Lietuvių dailė 1996–2005* (Vilnius, 2006).

[73] Tojana Račiūnaitė, *Vizijos ir atvaizdai. Basųjų karmelitų palikimas* (Vilnius, 2003).

[74] Laima Laučkaitė, *Vilniaus dailė XX amžiaus pradžioje* (Vilnius, 2002); Jolita
Mulevičiūtė, *Modernizmo link: Dailės gyvenimas Lietuvos Respublikoje 1918–1940* (Kaunas,

The input of the Soviet school, with strengths in typology and for-
mal analysis, has been transformed into contextual research in publica-
tions such as *Historicism and Modern Style in the Architecture of Vilnius*
by Nijolė Lukšionytė-Tolvaišienė and *Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis:
Between Symbolism and Modernism* by Rasa Andriušytė-Žukienė.[75] Last
but not least, the impact of semiotics at Vilnius University must be men-
tioned. Semiological analysis of visual matter has resulted in several dis-
sertations, among which Agnė Narušytė's study *The Aesthetics of Boredom
in Lithuanian Photography* is distinguished both for the depth of inquiry
into photography of the 1980s as well as its general methodological
thoroughness.[76]

Currently, art-historical research has established clear priorities: first,
to register artworks regardless of their position within the classical hierar-
chy of arts and, second, to interpret them from contemporary critical per-
spectives. However, individual and institutional research agendas reflect
these priorities only chaotically. Certain tendencies can be identified
nevertheless: scholars based in Kaunas are preoccupied with the history
of architecture, while their colleagues in Vilnius have become increas-
ingly specialized in dealing with the heritage of the Church. Attention
paid to the Soviet past is growing in both cities. Moreover, the decision
to open the National Art Gallery in Vilnius has consolidated specialists of
modernist and contemporary arts, who are quickly filling up gaps in this
research area.[77]

The need for a revised general history of Lithuanian art has been felt
for some time. However, the amount of 'unprocessed' data brought to
light in the last decades, together with the conviction that there is much
more unknown material, has kept art historians from undertaking this
ambitious task. Despite this, thirty-eight art historians contributed to
the student manual *Art History of Lithuania* that was published in 2002.[78]
Although the manual was quite a success, the need for a more conceptual
and thorough overview prompted Erika Grigoravičienė to write an over-

---

2001); Giedrė Jankevičiūtė, *Dailė ir valstybė: Dailės gyvenimas Lietuvos Respublikoje 1918–
1940* (Kaunas, 2003).

[75] Nijolė Lukšionytė-Tolvaišienė, *Istorizmas ir modernas Vilniaus architektūroje*, Acta
Academiae Artium Vilnensis/Vilniaus dailės akademijos darbai. Dailė 18 (Vilnius, 2000);
Rasa Andriušytė-Žukienė, *M.K. Čiurlionis: tarp simbolizmo ir modernizmo* (Vilnius, 2004).

[76] Agnė Narušytė, *The Aesthetics of Boredom. Lithuanian Photography 1980–1990*
(Vilnius, 2010).

[77] For example Rūta Goštautienė and Lolita Jablonskienė, eds., *Pažymėtos teritorijos*
(Vilnius, 2005).

[78] Alfonsas Andriuškevičius, et al., eds. *Lietuvos dailės istorija* (Vilnius, 2002).

view of theories after the pictorial turn. This was followed by a student manual on theories, methods and practices in art historical research and a reader of written sources for art history.[79]

In addition to these books presenting thematic research, various other publications should be briefly mentioned. In Estonia, practically the only place to issue art books and periodicals during the Soviet era was the state publishing house *Kunst*. Academic publishing is nowadays concentrated mostly at universities. There is one peer-reviewed periodical with an international editorial board in Estonia, traditionally published by the Estonian Union of Art Critics: *Studies in Art and Architecture*. There is also the magazine *kunst.ee* focusing on contemporary art, and *Estonian Art* issued in English by the Estonian Institute. Not everything is published in Estonian; for example, the series of so-called Karling conferences appeared in English or German, as did the series of conferences of *Place and Location*.[80] One should also mention the proceedings of the *Homburger Gespräche* published in Germany by the Böckler-Mare Balticum-Stiftung since 1978, dealing with the art history of all three Baltic States.[81]

In Latvia the results of art-historical research are available in regular editions of collected articles from the series *Materials for Latvian Art History* (since 1994) based on reports delivered at the Boriss Vipers Memorial Conferences initiated in 1988. *Mākslas Vēsture un Teorija* ('Art History & Theory'), a magazine with an international editorial board, is published by the Institute of Art History twice a year since 2003. The publishing house *Neputns* (founded in 1997) has emerged as the major force in the field of art-related publications—periodicals as well as catalogues and monographs. The visual arts magazine *Studija* largely deals with contemporary processes, but also with historical topics; specialized magazines added to the research agenda, dealing with design (*Dizaina Studija*, 2006–2012) and photography (*Foto Kvartāls*, 2006–2010) although the small readership

---

[79] Erika Grigoravičienė, *Vaizdinis posūkis: vaizdai, žodžiai, kūnai, žvilgsniai* (Vilnius, 2011); Giedrė Mickūnaitė, ed. *Dailėtyra: teorijos, metodai, praktikos* (Vilnius, 2012); Giedrė Jankevičiūtė, ed. *Dailės istorijos šaltiniai. Nuo seniausių laikų iki mūsų dienų. Antologija* (Vilnius, 2012).

[80] See Kodres, Maiste, and Vabar, eds., *Sten Karling and Baltic Art History* and Krista Kodres, Piet Lindpere and Eva Näriepa, eds., *Problem of Classical Ideal in the Art and Architecture of the Countries of the Baltic Sea* (Tallinn, 2003) and Krista Kodres and Merike Kurisoo, eds., *Art and the Church: Religious Art and Architecture in the Baltic Sea Region in the 13th–18th Centuries* (Tallinn, 2008). Sarapik, Tüür, and Laanemets, eds., *Place and Location*.

[81] These are published by the MCA Böckler-Mare Balticum-Stiftung. See the website www.martin-carl-adolf-boeckler-stiftung.de (accessed 10 May 2010).

and high costs have forced some magazines to become online publications only.).

In addition to the quarterly *Menotyra* other peer-reviewed periodicals and serials dealing with art-historical subjects have been established by the Lithuanian Academy. For example, the series *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis* has covered various fields of inquiry, dominated by topics from the pre-modernist periods.[82] Art historians of the Lithuanian Culture Research Institute publish a series under the title of *Dailės istorijos studijos*.[83] Volumes on art-historical topics of the journal *Darbai ir Dienos*, published by the Vytautas Magnus University, also appear regularly. In 2005, the need for an international scholarly journal dedicated to the issues of art history and visual culture was addressed by the foundation of *Acta Historiae Artium Balticae*; however, it failed to become a regular publication.[84]

This overview leads to the following conclusions: first, art historians in the Baltic States continue to write national histories of art, while clearly understanding that nationality is a political construct. Second, compared with the beginnings, the concept of national art has developed dramatically and today includes everything that shaped Baltic culture at different periods of its history.

---

[82] *Vilniaus dailės akademijos darbai: Dailė/Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis* (Vilnius, since 1993).

[83] *Dailės istorijos studijos* (Vilnius, since 2003).

[84] *Acta Historiae Artium Balticae* (Vilnius, since 2005).

IN SEARCH OF SYNTHESIS: ART HISTORY IN BELGIUM

Raphaël Pirenne

Translated by Matthew Rampley

Belgium was born following an operatic aria. On the evening of 25 August 1830, the performance of Daniel Auber's *La muette de Portici* at the Théâtre Royal de la Monnaie in Brussels concluded with a riot, which led, as the history and myth that grew up around this event would have it, to separation from the Netherlands. In 1986, in his *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art de Vasari à nos jours*, Germain Bazin mentioned Belgian and Dutch historiography in the same breath, in a single section entitled 'Pays-Bas'.[1] This alignment, motivated by geographical and historical as much as artistic reasons, may well be pertinent; the geographical entity of Belgium has always had a variable geometry. Annexed to France, and then to the Netherlands, it has seen its borders constantly revised and corrected, its malleable geographic and cultural character has inevitably raised the question of its identity, a powerful issue which, since 1830, has been ceaselessly raised with different degrees of intensity. Henri Pirenne indicated this right at the outset of his *History of Belgium*:[2] while this territory was distinguished by its lack of political, geographical and linguistic unity, it had been able to establish the semblance of coherence in a unified 'social life', which was itself determined by its multiple links to the cultures on its borders.[3] Belgian art history has played its own part in this particular destiny since the founding of the state in 1830.

As Paul Philippot has emphasized, this notion of identity has only gained historical relevance by the rejection of the ideas of the 'determinism of the milieu', of a 'historical, ethnically based, national constant', and by continually changing the point of view from the interior to the exterior.[4] The idea of a Belgian history of art, in the sense of a national heritage as well as that of a discipline, is thus inseparable from that of the constitution

---

[1] Germain Bazin, *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art de Vasari à nos jours* (Paris, 1986) 497.
[2] Henri Pirenne, *Histoire de la Belgique* (Brussels, 1929).
[3] Pirenne, *Histoire de la Belgique*, XI–XVI.
[4] Paul Philippot, *Jalons pour une méthode critique et une histoire de l'art en Belgique* (Brussels, 2005) 5–6.

of the nation. Nevertheless, rather than viewing the contours of art history through the prism of this question of identity—which would take us away from the domain of historiography and into that of the political and cultural history of ideas—this chapter will trace out chronologically the principal issues and developments in Belgian art history from the second half of the nineteenth century to the present.

The Field of Research

Let us start by emphasizing that art history has been taught not just in an academic milieu, but has taken many other routes, including the publications and events organized by various local and national archaeological and historical societies, or the training and education of artists. At the same time, the organization of art history as a recognized rigorous scholarly discipline taught in the academic domain, only dates back to the beginning of the twentieth century.[5] As Léo Van Puyvelde reminds us, it was only in 1903 that the teaching of the history of art was established by royal decree. The latter authorized the curriculum, the degrees and the setting up of the Advanced Institutes of the History of Art and Archaeology ('Instituts supérieurs d'histoire de l'art et d'archéologie') as central components of teaching in the university. This decree led to the creation of the Society of Courses in Art and Archaeology ('Société des cours d'Art et d'Archéologie') in Brussels, the Institute of the School of Advanced Studies ('Institut de l'École des hautes études') in Ghent as well as the institutes of the University of Liège and the Catholic University of Leuven.[6]

The precursor to this was the work of two striking personalities, who reveal, in their clearly different ways, not only the integration of art history into the universities, but also the evolution of the different axes that were characteristic of research in the years to come: Hyppolite Fierens-Gevaert (1870–1926) and Georges Hullin de Loo (1862–1945). Fierens-Gevaert followed a quite distinctive path; having been forced to give up a career as a

---

[5] It should be noted that courses in art history were delivered before then, although not in an organized way, by Hippolyte Fierens-Gevaert at the University of Liège, or by Auguste Vermeylen at the École des sciences politiques et sociales de Bruxelles.

[6] Jacques Lavalleye, 'L'Institut Supérieur d'Archéologue et d'Histoire de l'Université catholique de Louvain', *Revue des archéologues et historiens d'art de Louvain* II (1969) 10–11.

singer, he threw himself into becoming an art critic in Paris.[7] This predisposition to writing on art, as both a critic and author of essays, qualified him, on returning to Belgium, to take over the responsibility for aesthetics and art history at the University of Liège, and then later in Brussels.[8] His interests were twofold. They included early Netherlandish painters (the so-called 'Flemish Primitives', on whom he would publish an important monograph in 1909) and contemporary artistic practice, most notably, in the organization of exhibitions at the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium ('Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique', MRBAB), of which he was appointed director in 1919. Here he dedicated himself to the creation of a documentation centre with a view to 'setting up a research centre in the history of art', which would eventually form the basis of the future library of MRBAB.[9]

Self-taught, Fierens-Gevaert was a singular figure in Belgian art history, attesting to the links between the university and the museum. The career of Georges Hullin de Loo was altogether different. After training in law and philosophy at the University of Ghent, he continued his studies in Paris (at the Sorbonne and the École Pratique des Hautes Études, amongst others) where his interest in natural law and logic would later directly shape his research on Flemish painting from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. In 1902 he published a *Critical Catalogue*, which was a supplement to the catalogue of the exhibition of Flemish painters held in Bruges in the same year. In it he attempted to combine two methods that at the time were all too often kept separate: comparative criticism and archival analysis, with a view to linking 'these works without names to the names without works'.[10] Appointed professor at the University of Ghent in 1908, he published an important and seminal monograph on the illuminations of the *Très-Belles Heures de Jean de France, Duc de Berry*.[11]

Belgian art history was naturally oriented towards the study of the southern Low Countries from the late Middle Ages up to the present. Two fields of research illustrate this, although there was a clear arbitrary

---

[7] Fierens-Gevaert published articles but also various essays, including *Essai sur l'art contemporain* (Brussels, 1897) and *Psychologie d'une ville: Essai sur Bruges* (Brussels, 1901).

[8] Michele Van Kalck, ed., *Les Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique: Deux siècles d'histoire* (Brussels, 2003) 332–5.

[9] As he wrote to Jules Destrée in 1920: see van Kalck, *Les Musées royaux*, 334.

[10] Paul Bergmans, introduction to *Mélanges Hulin de Loo*, ed. Librairie Nationale d'Art et d'Histoire (Brussels and Paris, 1931) VIII.

[11] Georges Hulin de Loo, *Heures de Milan: Troisième partie des Très-Belles Heures de Notre Dame, enluminées par les peintres de Jean de France, Duc de Berry* (Brussels, 1910–11).

chronological division right from the beginning: early Netherlandish paint-
ing, and seventeenth-century Flemish painters (in which a central place is
accorded to the work of Rubens, van Dyck and Jordaens). Although Bel-
gian art historians do not have any prerogative when it comes to early
Netherlandish painters, it should be noted that several generations of
Belgian specialists developed a range of new research perspectives, and
thereby fuelled debates, which sometimes took on a polemic edge, over
questions of methodology and of the attribution (and de-attribution) or
individual works.[12]

   The creation of the Centre de Recherches des Primitifs Flamands
('Research Centre in Early Netherlandish Painting') in 1949, which was
driven by Paul Coremans, Henri Bouchery and Jacques Lavalleye, was a
significant initiative in the study of the subject. From its very beginnings
its goal was the creation of a comprehensive corpus of fifteenth-century
Flemish painters on both sides of the Atlantic, supported with a database,
a library and an image archive.[13] It has published the *Corpus de la pein-
ture des anciens Pays-Bas méridionaux au quinzième siècle* (sometimes also
called the *Corpus des Primitifs Flamands*) since the early 1950s. As Jacques
Lavalleye announced in the Preface to the first volume published in 1951,
its goal was to bring together three disciplines, with a view to systematize
the research that had already been begun by art historians such as Hulin
de Loo: 'stylistic criticism, analysis of written or printed sources, work in
the physics or chemistry laboratory.'[14]

   Between Fierens-Gevaert and Lavalleye, research in this area has
undergone a clear evolution, from attribution based on the methods of
connoisseurship to systematic scientific study that has drawn on a range
of different methods in order to overcome the limitation of individual sci-
entific and technological models. One example of the application of this
type of systematic study, in this case, to Rubens, is the *Corpus rubenianum
Ludwig Burchard*, based on work first undertaken by Alfred Michiels and
Max Rooses at the end of the nineteenth century. The latter, a conserva-

---

[12] Brigitte de Patoul and Roger Van Schoute, eds., *Les Primitifs flamands et leur temps*
(Tournai, 1994) 5–7.

[13] The centre has continued this project up to the present day, as the Centre for the
Study of Fifteenth-Century Painting in the southern Low Countries and the Principality of
Liège ('Centre d'étude de la peinture du quinzième siècle dans les Pays-Bas méridionaux
et la Principauté de Liège').

[14] Jacques Lavalleye and Paul Coremans, preface to Aquilin Janssens de Bisthoven and
Remi Parmentier, eds., *Les Primitifs flamands: Le Musée Communal de Bruges* (Antwerp,
1951) V–VI.

tor at the Plantin Moretus Museum in Antwerp, published the six-volume *L'œuvre de P.P. Rubens. Histoire et des descriptions des tableaux et dessins*.[15] Established as the result of an initiative of the Nationaal Centrum voor de Plastische Kunsten in de XVI en XVII eeuw (founded in 1959 in Antwerp by Frans Baudouin), the *Corpus rubenianum* would not have seen the light of day without the vast documentation assembled by Ludwig Burchard between 1920 and 1960.[16] Bequeathed to the city of Antwerp in 1952, and now housed in the Rubenianum, this documentary and critical resource has made possible the publication of as yet twenty-one of twenty-nine volumes, analysing the oeuvre of the Flemish painter, using material, formal and iconographic criteria.[17]

Institutions

Belgium rapidly acquired a range of first-class resources for research and the dissemination of knowledge. The Royal Museums of Fine Arts in Brussels form part of these. The history of their creation and subsequent fate is complex, which can be accounted for by the succession of different political regimes that characterized the history of Belgium from the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth century. Opened in 1803 as the museum of a *département* under French rule, they then became a municipal museum under the Dutch regime. It was not until 1842 that they were taken over by the Belgian state and became a national museum, in which the collections of historic art that had been acquired up until then were reorganized and, in 1887, housed in the buildings erected on the basis of the plans of Alphonse Ballat.

The history of the formation of the collections reveals an interest in representative works by artists from the regions forming the territory of Belgium as well as openness towards foreign schools, whether Dutch, French, Italian or Spanish. In addition, a section dedicated to modern Belgian art was opened in 1845, and at the turn of the nineteenth century the

---

[15] In 1854 Alfred Michiels published a *Catalogue des tableaux et dessins de Rubens*, although the final volume of the 'Catalogue' by Max Rooses appeared only in 1892. With regard to Rubens studies one should also mention the research by Leo Van Puyvelde, published in 1940, on the Antwerp painter's drawings.

[16] Frans Baudouin and Roger A. d'Hulst, Foreword to *Corpus rubenianum Ludwig Burchard. Part I. The Ceiling Paintings for the Jesuit Church in Antwerp*, ed. John Rupert Martin (London and New York, 1968) VII–XIV.

[17] For the Corpus rubenianum see: http://rubenianum.be/RBDefault.aspx?ptabindex=0&ptabid=1 (accessed 24 August 2010).

museum collected works exhibited by the *Groupe des Vingt* and then that of *La Libre Esthétique*, two artistic circles founded in Brussels by Octave Maus, involving artists such as James Ensor, Fernand Khnopff and Léon Spilliaert. Supported by a government concerned to ensure cohesion and a cultural foundation for the young nation, the Royal Museums were able to play a leading symbolic role in regards to the question of national identity.[18] Following the example of the museums of fine arts in the main Belgian towns (such as Antwerp, Ghent, Tournai or Mons) they played a key role in research, publishing catalogues of Belgian art, both historical and modern, and staging temporary exhibitions on art from the fourteenth to the twentieth centuries (from Bosch to Ensor), an undertaking that has been continued in the recent opening of the Magritte Museum within its walls, which has assembled one of the most important collections of the Surrealist artist and has prompted further research on this topic.[19]

In addition to the projects and publications stemming from the Royal Belgian Academy ('Académie Royale de Belgique'), two other institutions played, and continue to play, a major role in the documentation and scientific analysis of Belgian heritage.[20] The first, the Royal Commission of Sites and Monuments, founded in 1835, contributed to the cataloguing and inventorying of Belgian patrimony, movable and immovable, religious and civic as well as private. Before the linguistic division of 1969, it oversaw the publication of the *Bulletin des Commissions Royales d'Art et d'Archéologie*, which included fundamental scholarly articles on Belgian national heritage. This was subsequently systematized by the publication of *Patrimoine Monumental de la Belgique* in French and of *Bouwen door de eeuwen heen in Vlaanderen* ('Building through the Ages in Flanders') in Dutch. These summarized the collection of Belgian heritage, based on geographical regions.[21]

---

[18] On this subject see Van Kalck, *Les Musées royaux*, 323–4. On the Royal Museums of Fine Arts in Brussels see, too, Christophe Loir, *L'émergence des Beaux-Arts en Belgique: Institutions, Artistes, Public et Patrimoine (1773–1835)* (Brussels, 2004).

[19] See http://www.musee-magritte-museum.be (accessed 22 May 2010).

[20] Founded in 1842, the Royal Belgian Academy of Archaeology ('Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique') publishes the *Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art*. The Fine Arts section of the Belgian Royal Academy, founded in 1845, publishes, for its part, its own *Bulletin*. Both of these publications include art-historical articles.

[21] This project has been supported by Raymond Lemaire, a central figure in Belgian heritage, and a professor in Architectural History at the Université Catholique de Louvain, one of the authors of the Charter of Venice and a co-founder of ICOMOS (Conseil International des Monuments et des Sites).

The second institution is the Royal Institute of Artistic Heritage ('Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique', IRPA). It originated in 1957 out of a merging of the Central Iconographic Archives of National Art ('Archives Centrales Iconographiques d'Art National') and the Central Laboratory of the Museums of Belgium ('Laboratoire Central des Musées de Belgique', ACL), created in the wake of the Second World War. IRPA had a threefold mission: (1) the production of inventories; (2) the preservation of Belgian heritage; (3) research.[22] As Paul Coremans stated, the scientific model adopted by IRPA was interdisciplinary, combining the study of historical sources, scientific examination, technical analysis and stylistic criticism. This approach was applied to works as prestigious as the Ghent Altarpiece by the van Eyck brothers, *The Adoration of the Magi* by Bruegel the Elder, or Rubens's *Raising of the Cross*. Furthermore, IRPA has gradually set up an important image archive, which is now online and accessible to the wider public, based on the model of the BALAT project (Belgian Art Links Tools) which aims to provide a comprehensive list of institutions and scholars involved in research in Belgium.[23]

Contemporary art occupies an equally important place in museum institutions. Already a feature of the Royal Museums, an openness to contemporary art has been at the centre of the artistic programme of the Palais des Beaux-Arts in Brussels built by Victor Horta. It has had a wide ranging exhibitions policy since it was opened in 1924; in the 1930s it staged retrospectives of, for example, Modigliani, Dufy and Magritte. In 1932 and 1933 Claude Spaak and the Surrealist artist E.L.T. Mesens organized exhibitions on the contemporary employment of film and photography, exhibitions that rivalled those held in Stuttgart and Philadelphia at that time.[24] This policy was continued after the war, most particularly during the 1970s and 1980s, when the artistic programme was overseen by Yves Gevaert (who created the eponymous publishing house) and Michel

---

[22] Paul Coremans, 'Editorial', *Bulletin de l'Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique* 1 (1958) 3–4. One might also mention the creation of various research centres using laboratory methods, such as the European Centre of Archaeometry (University of Liège) or the Laboratory for the Study of Artworks (at the Université Catholique de Louvain) which initiated colloquia on the study of underdrawings from 1975 onwards.

[23] See the website http://balat.kikirpa.be/site (accessed 22 May 2010).

[24] Valérie Montens, *Le Palais des Beaux-Arts: La création d'un haut-lieu de culture à Bruxelles (1828–1945)* (Brussels, 2000) 190–1.

Baudson, and included exhibitions on André Cadere, Hanne Darboven or Marcel Broodthaers, with a preference for works *in situ*.[25]

On both sides of the linguistic frontier, art-historical study of contemporary art was supported with the creation of museum resources of leading importance. The Stedelijk Museum voor Actuele Kunst (SMAK) based in Ghent is the first museum of contemporary Belgian art. It was established in 1975, although the idea was set in motion in 1957, and housed, initially, within the Ghent Museum of Fine Art, it was directed by a central figure in Belgian art history, Jan Hoet, who later was the curator of *documenta IX* in Kassel in 1992. SMAK has had an ambitious acquisitions policy, forming one of the most important and unified public collections in Belgium. But, equally, it has organized a wide-ranging series of exhibitions, including *Chambres d'amis* in 1986, which exhibited works by Joseph Kosuth, Sol Lewitt and Bruce Nauman in different private spaces in Ghent, or *La Porte rouge*, staged while the museum was being installed in its new buildings in 1996, and which reclaimed the museum stores. The history of the Museum of Contemporary Art of the French Community of Belgium ('Musée des arts contemporains de la Communauté française de Belgique', MAC's) is more recent. Built on the Grand Hornu industrial site, it was opened in 2002 with Laurent Busine at the helm, who has pursued a policy of exhibitions organized around the themes of memory and the relation of contemporary artistic practice to the wider world.

New Perspectives

Amongst recent developments in art-historical research one can note a willingness to open up national frontiers with a view to gaining a better understanding of the artistic relations that place the art of the old Low Countries and, subsequently, Belgium, within a wider international framework. The example of studies of Rheno-Mosan art, which have re-sited the art of the southern Low Countries between 800 and 1400 in terms of its relations with the Rhineland, has prompted research on the painting, sculpture and architecture of the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, to open its horizons to the artistic relations with southern Europe, which has enabled a reconsideration of issues to do with the 'Gothic-Renaissance' style, or the

---

[25] The latter was also director of *Jeunesse & Arts plastiques*, a society housed in the Palais des Beaux-Arts de Bruxelles, which since 1959, has organized lectures for the wider public, delivered by internationally known art historians and art critics.

nature of the Flemish Baroque in a European context.[26] These relations are no longer considered in terms of 'sources' and 'influences', but equally, in terms of the issue of patronage and the art market.[27] Moreover, each art form is no longer treated separately, but rather with a view to the reciprocal influences of one on the other. Thus, just like engraving, the study of miniatures, glass or textiles has gained in importance, and these media are no longer understood simply as vehicles for the transmission of styles, but as fully fledged artistic expressions, with an irreducible originality, once they are placed in a visual culture shared by all arts and sustained by a diverse range of mutual influence.[28] The same openness to international artistic exchange left its mark on research concerned with the arts in Belgium in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

During his tenure as conservator at the Royal Museums (1950–1975) Paul Fierens set up the Archives of Contemporary Belgian Art ('Archives de l'Art contemporain Belge'), which had assembled highly important material for the study of Belgian artists. In the universities one might mention, amongst the numerous scholarly initiatives, two poles that represent the most recent research directions. The first, represented by the Research Group in Modern Art ('Groupe de Recherche sur l'Art

---

[26] Jacques Stiennon and Rita Lejeune, *Rhin-Meuse: Art et Civilization 800–1400* (Brussels, 1972). See, too, earlier works such as Marguerite Devigne, *La sculpture mosane du XIIᵉ au XVIᵉ siècle: Contribution à l'étude de l'art dans la région de la Meuse moyenne* (Paris, 1932); Joseph Phillippe, *L'Évangéliaire de Notger et la chronologie de l'art mosan des époques pré-romane et romane (miniatures, ivoires, orfèvreries)* (Brussels, 1956); Nicole Dacos, 'Présentation', in *Relations artistiques entre les Pays-Bas et l'Italie à la Renaissance. Etudes dédiées à Suzanne Sulzberger* (Brussels and Rome, 1980) I–VII. See, too, the earlier research by Jacques Lavalleye on Justus of Ghent or Josse van Wassenhove, a Flemish painter who emigrated to Urbino in the fifteenth century and executed the gallery of illustrious persons for the ducal palace of the Montefeltro: Jacques Lavalleye, *Juste de Gand. Peintre de Frédéric de Montefeltre* (Leuven, 1936) and *Le Palais Ducal d'Urbin. Les Primitifs flamands* (Brussels, 1964). See the round table discussion in Monique Chatenet, Krista de Jonge, Ethan Matt Kavaler, and Norbert Nussbaum, "Architecture européenne: un 'gothique de la Renaissance' autour de 1500?", *Perspectives* 2 (2006) 280–8. See, too, the research project at the University of Antwerp, *Identiteit, functie en expansie van de Vlaamse barok in Europese context*. Information on the project is available at: http://www.researchportal.be (accessed 1 June 2010).

[27] One might mention here studies by Filip Vermeylen, Maximilien Martens or Joost Van Der Auwera, which expanded the circle of influence and the circuits of artistic and economic exchange on to the wider European level.

[28] See the work of Maurits Smeyers, who in 1983 founded the Centre for the Study of the Illuminated Manuscript (Illuminare) attached to the KUL. The Centre publishes the *Corpus sur les manuscrits enluminés*, which is a study of illumination production in the southern Low Countries between 1350 and 1550. On glass see the studies by Yvette Vanden Bemden in the different volumes of *Corpus Vitrearum* dedicated to Belgium.

Moderne', GRAM), based at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, has focused on Belgian art of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with a particular emphasis on the main artistic currents of the period, from Symbolism to Cobra, via Surrealism. The second pole is based around the study of artistic practices of the second half of the twentieth century, with a particular interest in new media. The work of the Centre Lieven Gevaert (LGC, at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and Université catholique de Louvain) has involved interdisciplinary analysis of the uses and functions of photography, examining, for example, the critical function of photography in contemporary art or theorist-photographers.

In recent years there has been a process of methodological and epistemological renewal. Two figures have brought their international influence to this reassessment. Interrogating iconology in the light of semiology and formalism (measured against a specific aesthetic critique), by means of a re-reading of the principal art historians of German 'Kunstwissenschaft' and the critical Italian thinking of Benedetto Croce, Paul Philippot developed a history of art that was attentive to both the material reality of artworks and their conservation, and also to a hermeneutics that was particularly sensitive to the evolution of the status of the image articulated in terms of the history of forms.[29] As to modern and contemporary art, the work of Thierry de Duve has prompted a rich reflection on the articulations of the relation of art history, art theory, aesthetics and art criticism. In 2000, following his seminal studies that took the work of Marcel Duchamp as their point of departure, and formed the bases of an archaeology of modernism, de Duve threw himself into an ambitious exhibition, *Voici. 100 ans d'art contemporain* (staged at the Palais des Beaux-Arts, Brussels), which interrogated anew a century of artistic history, inflected by three complementary themes: the presentation of the work, the address to the spectator, and, finally, the community.[30]

The methodological and epistemological impulse of these pioneering figures (and of many others, too) has been continued in the present in work undertaken in a number of different research centres and different publishing programmes. Interrogation of the nature of the visual and

---

[29] See, for example, Paul Philippot, *Jalons pour une méthode critique et une histoire de l'art en Belgique* (Brussels, 2005) 117–37.

[30] Thierry de Duve, *Pictorial Nominalism: On Marcel Duchamp's Passage from Painting to the Readymade* (Minneapolis, MN, 1991); de Duve, *Kant after Duchamp* (Cambridge, MA, 1998); de Duve, *Voici, 100 ans d'art contemporain* (Ghent, 2000); de Duve, *Clement Greenberg between the Lines: Including a Debate with Clement Greenberg* (Chicago, IL, 2010).

of hybrid image-text forms has found a space in the journal *Voir (barré)* (first published 1990) or the e-journal *Image and Narrative* (first published 2000).[31] Renewed iconological study, influenced by cultural analysis and the anthropology of the image, is attested by the recent creation of research groups such as the *Iconology Research Group* (IRG, at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven) or the *Group for Early Modern Cultural Analysis* (GEMCA, at the Université catholique de Louvain), which opened up art history to the interdisciplinary analysis of a large array of diverse objects, largely outside of the usual framework of the fine arts.[32] In addition, a number of other initiatives have indicated the critical reception of gender studies and visual studies.[33]

One might round out discussion of these new perspectives by mentioning the return to the historiography of art, evident in the formation in 2005 of the group FNRS (Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique) 'Historiographie et épistémologie de l'histoire de l'art'. In this context the anticipated synthetic account of the character of Belgian art history, which still suffers from a lack of communication between Flemish and francophone universities, remains to be written.

---

[31] The journal *Voir (barré)*, now no longer published, can be considered one of the first beginnings of *Visual Studies* in Belgium, and was created on the initiative of the Belgian Braille League; it commenced publication in the 1990s, combing disciplines such as cultural anthropology, semiology and aesthetics. The journal *Image and Narrative* is available online at: http://www.imageandnarrative.be (accessed 22 May 2010).

[32] See the websites: http://www.iconologyresearchgroup.org (accessed 22 May 2010) and http://gemca.fltr.ucl.ac.be (accessed 22 May 2010).

[33] In this context one might mention work by Kathleen Van Der Stighelen, who, in the wake of gender studies, has studied, amongst others, the status of women artists in Belgium and the Low Countries between 1500 and 1950; see Kathleen Van Der Stighelen, *A chacun sa grâce: Femmes artistes en Belgique et au Pays-Bas: 1500–1950* (Ghent, 1999).

ART HISTORY IN BULGARIA: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS, RESEARCH DIRECTIONS AND INDIVIDUAL SCHOLARS

Elka Bakalova

The development of Bulgarian scholarly life officially began after the liberation of Bulgaria from Ottoman rule in 1878. In fact the ground was prepared with the founding of the Bulgarian Literary society in Brăila (Romania) in 1869 which, in 1878, moved its seat to Sofia, and in 1911 was renamed The Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, an autonomous state organization for scientific research. The University of Sofia was founded in 1888, by virtue of a decision of the National Assembly, yet neither at the time of its establishment nor today does it have a specialism in 'art history'.[1] Indeed, while the new state was quick to establish its own educational institutions, the first generations of art historians were all trained abroad, particularly in Germany, to which Bulgaria had close political and social ties. Thus the art historian, archaeologist and literary critic Andrei Protich (1875–1959) studied philosophy at the Universities of Heidelberg and Leipzig in 1896–1897, and then at the Polytechnic in Dresden. He graduated in philology and art history with philosophy at Leipzig in 1901. Likewise Gavril Katzarov, a classical scholar, historian and archaeologist, rector of the University of Sofia and director of the National Archaeological Museum (1929–1930) and the Bulgarian Archaeological Institute (after 1940), graduated in classical philology at the University of Leipzig, having studied Classics in Berlin and Munich.

The oldest institution dealing with the study of Bulgarian art was the Archaeological Museum in Sofia, founded in 1892 (originally known as the 'National Museum', with three collections: medieval, numismatic, and ethnographic) and ceremonially opened to the public in 1905. In 1906 the ethnographic collection was removed and became the Ethnographic Institute with its own museum. In 1909 the National Museum was renamed the National Archaeological Museum with the function of preserving monuments of culture in two new sections: (1) medieval and (2) fine art with,

---

[1] Today only separate courses are offered for different specialist subjects. For example, Western European medieval art is taught within the MA programme in medieval philosophy, while general art history is taught as part of Fine Arts.

later, an additional section for pre-history. It was in this institution that the study of ancient and medieval art began. The Bulgarian Archaeological Institute, a private institution associated with it, was founded in 1920. Bogdan Filov (1883–1945) (former director of the National Museum, professor in Archaeology at Sofia University and author of the first studies on ancient and medieval art and architecture) was elected its first director.[2] The Institute was subsidized annually by the Ministry of Public Education and a number of other sponsors and newly founded funds. Over the following twenty years the Institute and its members carried out active research and publishing activities. Up to 1942 the Institute brought out over twenty-five of its own publications, among them thirteen volumes of its Proceedings. Contact was established with hundreds of institutions together with book exchanges with numerous institutes, universities and libraries in Europe and round the world.

Following the founding of the modern Bulgarian state, the study of art and architecture played an important role in the development of a conception of national identity. Particular attention was given to the study of the history of Bulgarian medieval art and architecture, from the early years of the twentieth century onwards; this paralleled the development of the study of Byzantine and Eastern Christian art elsewhere. Eager to promote their distinctive national culture, the first Bulgarian art historians thus did not engage in the study of Ottoman art situated within the territories of the new state.

Writings on Bulgarian art were scattered in the works of Bulgarian and non-Bulgarian historians, linguists, archaeologists and ethnographers, and were gathered together for the first time by Bogdan Filov in his book *Old Bulgarian Art*, first published abroad in 1919, and coming out in Bulgarian in 1924.[3] Filov's work, in spite of the weaknesses in its general characterization of the Byzantine style in art (given in a separate chapter at the end), still retains some methodological validity in traditional archaeology. The next phase in the study of Bulgarian art was connected to the cultural impact of Russian emigration to Bulgaria after the revolution of 1917. The well-known medievalist Nikodim Kondakov (1844–1925) emigrated to Bulgaria and became a professor at the University of Sofia (1920–22) and

---

[2] Bogdan Filov, *Антични паметници в Народния музей* (Sofia, 1912); Filov, *Софийската църква 'Св. София'* (Sofia, 1913).

[3] Bogdan Filov, *Early Bulgarian Art* (Bern, 1919); Filov, *L'ancien art bulgare* (Paris, 1922); Filov, *Старобългарското изкуство: (Изследване)* (Sofia, 1924).

member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; he later moved to Prague as a professor at the Charles University.

At the same time the young André Grabar (1896–1990) arrived in Bulgaria and was immediately appointed at the Archaeological Museum and, together with the museum's photographer, began the systematic documentation of wall paintings in Bulgarian churches and monasteries, which were the subject of his dissertation. In his search for more extensive research facilities, Grabar went to Strasbourg and Paris, defending his thesis on religious painting in Bulgaria which presented the first brilliant panorama of medieval Bulgarian art and has remained the starting point for all studies in this field.[4] Grabar was also the author of the first monograph on the most significant monument of Bulgarian medieval art, the Church of Saints Panteleimon and Nicholas in Boyana.[5] This was the time of the emergence of the major works of scholars of the so-called 'Iconographic school', which had accumulated abundant material from their 'archaeological visits' to various regions of the Byzantine world, including the territory of present Bulgaria.[6] However, Grabar perfected the iconographic method, emphasizing the ideological functions of art and its ties with the historical and cultural context. Decisive in this respect was his book *The Emperor in Byzantine Art*, in which the imperial portrait was seen not only as the development of the late Roman portrait and the portrait from Hellenistic times, but above all as a reflection of the political ideology of the period.[7] Finally, Grabar also improved the method of structural-functional analysis in his study of the cult of saints and relics and further developed the range of issues in the field of 'society and art' in

---

[4] André Grabar, *La peinture religieuse en Bulgarie* (Paris, 1928). Grabar speaks of this period of his life in his autobiography published in Bulgaria 'Autobiographical Notes', *Izkoustvo* 7 (1986) 26–8.

[5] André Grabar, *Боянската църква* (Sofia, 1924).

[6] Nikodem Kondakov, *Иконография Богоматери*, 2 vols. (St Petersburg, 1914–15); Gabriel Millet, *Recherches sur l'iconographie de l'Évangile* (Paris, 1916). These works were preceded by an unremitting gathering of facts which resulted in the emergence of a unique genre in scientific literature: the 'archaeological travel'. See, for example, Nikodem Kondakov, *Путешествие на Синай в 1881 г: Из путевых впечатлений*. Древности Синайского монастыря (Odessa, 1882); Kondakov, *Археологическое путешествие по Сирии и Палестине* (St Petersburg, 1904); Kondakov, *Македония: Археологическое путешествие* (St Petersburg, 1909).

[7] André Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin: Recherches sur l'art officiel de l'empire d'Orient* (Paris, 1936); Gilbert Dagron, 'André Grabar: 26 juillet 1896–3 octobre 1990', Annuaire Collège de France 1990–91 (Paris, 1991) 91–2.

relation to Byzantine art.[8] The methodological premises of Grabar's works still provide the basis of all Bulgarian research on Byzantine and medieval Bulgarian art today.

'Art history' was first taught at the State Drawing School, opened on 1 October 1896 by a decree signed by Prince Ferdinand, making it the oldest institution of higher education in Bulgaria. In 1921 the State Drawing School was renamed the Academy of Art. In the 1920s Anton Mitov, the eminent artist, began a series of public lectures on the history of art, which achieved great success with the public in Sofia. They were illustrated with 'light pictures' (the predecessors of present-day slides), shown with a primitive projection device, previously unknown in Bulgaria, and kept to this day as a museum relic. The same professor delivered lectures for students in the course of eight semesters on ancient art, medieval art and the art of the Renaissance; only towards the end, in the last few lectures, did he discuss Bulgarian art. In spite of the fact that there was no specialization in art history at the Academy of Art, graduates of the Academy played an important role in Bulgarian art-historical scholarship, especially between the 1940s and 1970s. Artists, and in particular, graduates of the State Drawing School (later the National Art Academy), were also the first to undertake critical analyses and studies of the developments in contemporary Bulgarian art.

The need to give meaning to artefacts, to place them in a given group, typology, genre, or movement, only comes after the quantitative accumulation of material and social integration. The situation of scholarship on the decorative arts in Bulgaria (including architectural decoration, temporary decoration, and applied art) at the end of the nineteenth century, when the first examples appeared, reflects this initial period of development. In 1909 (1910) the Ministry of Public Education appointed D. Daskalov at the State Drawing School, with the task of setting up a museum and library, as well as teaching applied arts.[9] The first experiments in criticism that attempted to give meaning to these arts, referred to as 'applied art', 'minor arts', or 'industrial art', came from graduates of the School. The debates

---

[8] André Grabar, *Martyrium: recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1946); Grabar, 'Pseudo-Kodinos et les cérémonies de la Cour Byzantine au XIVème siècle', *Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues: Actes du Colloque organisé par l'Association internationale des études byzantines à Venise en septembre 1968* (Venice, 1971) 195–221.

[9] Maria Miteva, *Decorative Art in Bulgaria in the Beginning of the Modern Age: Adopting the European Experience (End of the 19th–Beginning of the 20th century)* (PhD Dissertation, Sofia, 2009) 12–13.

on the problems of the decorative arts were close to those in the field of architecture. A key role was played here by the Bulgarian Engineering and Architectural Society (BEAS) and its journal *Architect*, to which both non-Bulgarian architects working in Bulgaria, and Bulgarian graduates of European Academies and Polytechnics contributed. Analysing the interplay between the arts, the journal raised the question of the need for a Bulgarian style, and of whose work could be considered representative of a 'School' of architecture in Bulgaria.

The presence of foreign architects such as Friedrich Grünanger (1856–1929), Viktor Rumpelmayer (1830–1885), Adolf Kolar (1841–1900), Josef Prošek (1861–1928) or Henri Meyer (1856–1921) resulted in a strong European influence. 'The foreigners introduced qualitatively new parameters in Bulgarian architecture, such as typological, functional organization, a plan structure, a spatial composition, style and ornamentation, new construction materials and technologies.'[10] However this created a corresponding contrary trend, namely, a break with European styles (Neoclassicism, Neo-Baroque and the strongly eclectic practices stemming from them) and a search for new dimensions of architecture, involving a turn to tradition and the creation of a 'national' style. The question of the national appearance of architecture was raised on the pages of the BEAS journal in connection with the reconstruction of a number of churches in central Sofia and other public and memorial buildings (such as the mausoleum of Prince Alexander Battenberg).[11]

One prominent figure who merits particular mention was Andrei Protich, the second director of the National Museum (1921–1928). One of the leading art critics throughout the 1920s, he was the first to present a general overview of Bulgarian art since the Liberation of 1878.[12] Applying the methods of art criticism to monuments from the Middle Ages on the basis of stylistic analysis, he introduced the concept of artistic 'schools' and in

---

[10] See Petar Jokimov, 'Architektur in Bulgarien 1878–1920/Архитектурата в България, 1878–1920', in *Bulgarien. Architektonische Fragmente/България—архитектурни фрагменти*, ed. Adolf Stiller (Salzburg, 2007) 50.

[11] The issue was commented on in several articles. See, for example, S. Geshov, 'Инженери и артисти', *БИАД* 11 and 12 (1899) 250–2; Friedrich Grünanger and G. Kozarov, 'Архитектурата и значението ѝ за строителната ни индустрия', *БИАД* 6 and 7 (1900) 109–13; N. Neshov, 'Старите и новите художествени направления в Архитектурата', *БИАД* 8, 9 and 10 (1899) 207–9; 11 and 12 (1899) 276–7; D.G. Popov, 'Въпросът за националната ни архитектура', *БИАД* 14 (1923) 241; Т.А., 'По черквостроението в българската столица', *БИАД* 8, 9 and 10 (1899) 166–9; Anton Tornjov, 'Постройката на духовната академия', *БИАД* 18 (1923) 302–3.

[12] Andrei Protich, *Петдесет години българско изкуство* (Sofia, 1934).

particular the 'South-west School' of Bulgarian medieval painting.[13] How-
ever, owing to an insufficiently historical approach, the scientific value
of this attempt was greatly limited. Some time later, Protich attempted
to trace the development of Bulgarian art from the fall of the Bulgarian
state in 1393 to Ottoman rule up to the Liberation in 1878 and to provide
an overall characterization of Revival-period art in his article 'Denation-
alization and Revival in our Art from 1393 to 1879'.[14] Alongside Protich,
Bogdan Filov dedicated a work to 'The Revival of Bulgarian art'.[15] Regard-
less of how we look on the contribution of these first studies, they clearly
attempted to fill in a painful lacuna and give an answer to an intellectual
need. Nevertheless, it also became clear that the information known at
the time was too scant, and was insufficient to provide any convincing
summary.

If, in the early 1930s, the study of medieval art yielded its first serious
results, scholarship on the art of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—
a period known in Bulgarian history as the 'National Revival'—was still
at the threshold of scientific development.[16] Although partly due to the
dominance of the medieval Byzantine heritage in the construction of Bul-
garian identity, this fact cannot be explained by a lack of public inter-
est towards the National Revival period. On the contrary: throughout the
first decades of the twentieth century, serious studies were published
of the outlook and ideas of the period and its socio-historical develop-
ment, including its literature. This in turn stimulated public interest in
art, yet the information was limited, and the specialists who could offer
an interpretation were few in number. Nikolai Rainov, a well-known artist
and professor at the Art Academy who had authored the first history of
art in Bulgarian, also published a study of the graphic works of Nikolai

---

[13] Andrei Protich, 'Югозападната школа в българската стенопис', in *Сборник в чест на Васил Златарски* (Sofia, 1925) 243–91.

[14] Andrei Protich, 'Денационализация и възраждане на нашето изкуство от 1393 до 1879 г.' *България 1000 години, 927–1927* (Sofia, 1930) 198, 384 and 397.

[15] Bogdan Filov, 'Възраждането на българското изкуство', *Българска историческа библиотека*, chapters II, III (Sofia, 1931).

[16] The National Revival period, the era of transition from the Middle Ages to mod-
ern times, is generally considered a time of restoration of the nation's historical memory,
together with the struggle for national liberation, the formation of a Bulgarian bourgeoisie
and the emergence of the intelligentsia. A period of secular education, it is usually held to
have begun in 1762, when Saint Paisius of Hilendar's *Slavonic Bulgarian History*, the first
history of Bulgaria, was written, and to have concluded with the War of the Liberation of
Bulgaria from Ottoman Rule, ending in 1878.

Pavlovich, a central topic of National Revival art.[17] Pavlovich (1835–1894), a Bulgarian artist who began his studies in Vienna, then graduated at the Academy of Fine Art in Munich. On his return to Bulgaria he began to produce history paintings inspired by Saint Paisius of Hilendar's *Slavonic Bulgarian History* (1762), the first history of Bulgaria. Romantic in spirit, Pavlovich's works were created to consolidate the national consciousness and awareness, and illustrate important events in Bulgarian history.

The first in-depth accounts of the history of Bulgarian architecture appeared in the 1930s; in most cases these were publications of the Archaeological Museum. The head of the museum's medieval section was the eminent medievalist Krastju Miyatev, who at the time was publishing major works on architecture and art of the First Bulgarian Kingdom of the ninth and tenth centuries.[18] He was associated with Alexander Rashenov, the first historian of Bulgarian architecture and author of the only monograph on the churches in Nessebar (the medieval Messemvria), and the medievalist Nikola Mavrodinov, the youngest of this group of scholars, who had specialized in art history in Liège.[19] The works of Mavrodinov gave an outline of Bulgarian art history up to the end of the 1950s and it was only his premature death (in 1958) that brought an end to his fertile productivity. His true sense of style and his awareness of specific artistic features yielded valuable results in almost every field of the history of Bulgarian art. At the same time they constitute some of the finest texts of Bulgarian literature on art.[20] It is also important to note the contribution of Asen Vasiliev, a painter with the conviction that the roots of Bulgarian art should be sought in church monuments. He began to work at the National Archaeological Museum (1940–48), and began his systematic travels around churches and monasteries from the period of the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries. His first complex research expedition

---

[17] Nikolai Rainov, *История на пластичните изкуства*, 12 vols. (Sofia, 1931–39). See Rainov, 'Графиката на Николай Павлович', *Годишник на Народната библиотека в Пловдив, 1922* (Sofia, 1925).

[18] Krastju Miyatev, *Кръглата църква в Преслав* (Sofia, 1932); Miyatev, *Преславската керамика* (Sofia, 1936).

[19] Alexander Rashenov, *Месемврийските църкви* (Sofia, 1932); Nikola Mavrodinov, *Еднокорабната и кръстовидна църква по българските земи до края на XIV век* (Sofia, 1931).

[20] See, for example, Nikola Mavrodinov, *Старобългарската живопис* (Sofia, 1946); Mavrodinov, *Новата българска живопис: История на българското изкуство от епохата на Паисия до освобождението и на българската живопис от Освобождението до наши дни* (Sofia, 1947); Mavrodinov, *Изкуството на българското Възраждане* (Sofia, 1962).

to monasteries on the peninsula of Mount Athos (above all, the Bulgarian monastery of Zographou), was organized in 1943 by the Ministry of Public Education with the support of the Ministry of War. The first results of this work were published in articles and albums, which were of some public significance. However, with their didactic syncretism, they cannot be seen as purely academic works on the history of art.

Vasiliev's main work on Bulgarian art, *Bulgarian Masters from the Bulgarian Revival Period*, which was published after the Second World War, has to this day not lost its significance.[21] His work contained large quantities of data from archives, inscriptions on wall paintings and icons of master painters, wood-carvers, goldsmiths and masons that had hitherto been unpublished, and he also undertook the task of attributing them to major artistic centres.

After the Second World War, interest in the problem of cultural heritage, together with the issue of preparing a comprehensive history of Bulgarian art, became topical. The cultural policy of the state supported the study of cultural monuments on a broad scale. In order to support museum activities, a National Institute for Cultural Monuments was founded in 1956 with the task of promoting state policy regarding the preservation, conservation and restoration of cultural heritage in Bulgarian lands. The Institute of Fine Arts (today the Institute of Art Studies) was founded in 1947 at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Initially the staff of the Institute included four academicians with a number of eminent archaeologists and art historians from the Archaeological Museum as associates. The directions of future research were outlined in one of the first reports of the director, the sculptor Ivan Lazarov: 'The first task of the Institute', he declared, 'is to gather our cultural legacy [heritage] . . . to reveal all the basic and essential characteristics of our national artists, in other words, form, colour and so forth, which enabled them to create great art; and to reveal that art which has met and satisfied the aesthetic needs of the people and enhanced its cultural development.'[22]

As early as 1948 a concrete research plan was adopted, which was to include the study of (1) artworks by Bulgarian craftsmen before and after the Liberation of Bulgaria (pottery, wrought-iron, goldsmithery, carpentry, woodcarving, stone masonry, book-binding and so forth); (2) the reflection

---

[21] Asen Vasiliev, *Български възрожденски майстори: Живописци, резбари, строители* (Sofia, 1965).

[22] Elka Bakalova, 'За ранната история на Института за изобразителни изкуства', *Journal of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences* 5–6 (1998) 3–7.

of historical events in works by Bulgarian artists; (3) the publication of monographs on Bulgarian painters before and after the Liberation. The Bulgarian Academy of Sciences began organizing complex expeditions for the study of various parts of the country, immediately publishing the material in separate volumes. The Institute of Fine Arts began to publish the series *Bulgarsko Houozhestveno Nasledstovo* (Bulgarian Art Heritage), which presented surveys of various crafts and applied arts.[23] In-depth studies were also published in the 'Proceedings of the Institute for Fine Arts' (from 1956 to 1973), and from 1968 onwards in the *Проблеми на изкуството/Arts Studies Quarterly*. In 1949 the Institute for Urban Studies and Architecture (later, the Centre for Architectural Studies) was founded in Sofia; among its main tasks were the study of the 'theory and history of architecture.' Beyond the concrete practical tasks facing the Institute, it also conducted work on the history of architecture in Bulgaria, some of which was subsequently published in book form.[24] This period also saw an important shift in terms of critical commentary on contemporary art; in the 1960s those who wrote about new art in Bulgaria were still mainly practising architects and artists while, from the 1970s onwards, specialized works in this areas were increasingly written by art critics and art historians.

If scholars working in the mid-twentieth century had studied and trained abroad, above all in Germany and France, the next generation of Bulgarian researchers were graduates from the Russian and Soviet art school, above all in Moscow, Leningrad (St Petersburg) or Prague. Important publications of the 1970s included a history of Bulgarian art, the first volume of which came out in 1976, as well as an encyclopaedia of fine art in Bulgaria.[25] At the same time a number of specialized studies of different monuments and issues were undertaken, including, for example, Atanas Bozhkov's works on the development of historical painting in Bulgaria, on the images of St Cyril and St Methodius, on the development of Bulgarian icon painting, as well as on the artistic heritage of the Zographou

---

[23] Asen Vasiliev, ed., *Каменна пластика* (Sofia, 1973); Dimitar Drumev, *Златарско изкуство* (Sofia, 1976); Drumev, *Резбарско изкуство* (Sofia, 1989).

[24] See, for example, Georgi Koshukharov, ed., *Архитектурата на първата и втората българска държава: Материали* (Sofia, 1975); Margarita Koeva, *Паметници на културата през Българското Възраждане: Архитектура и изкуство на българските църкви* (Sofia, 1977).

[25] *История на българското изобразително изкуство, т.1* (Sofia, 1976); Aleksandŭr Obretenov, ed., *Енциклопедия на изобразителните изкуства в България*, 3 vols. (Sofia, 1980–2006).

Monastery on Mount Athos.[26] At the same time the publishing house of
the Union of Bulgarian Painters began to publish a series of monographs
on church mural paintings.

The founders of the Institute of Fine Arts were clearly aware of the need
above all to build up a documentary 'database' of artworks, which would
be continuously enriched; the issue of its overall digitalization is currently
being raised. The basic concern of the Institute, both at the time of its
establishment and today, is the problem of artistic heritage of the Bulgar-
ian territories. Among its projects those which have proved the most stim-
ulating and have attracted the most sponsorship are documented editions
of the corpus of wall paintings in Bulgaria from the eighteenth century; the
latest volume, sponsored by the Onassis Benefit Foundation, explored the
theme of Greek painters in Bulgaria.[27]

The entire development of art history in Bulgaria throughout the period
of so-called 'Real Socialism' (from Stalin's death to the introduction of
perestroika by Gorbachev) was subordinated to the restrictions of the
Communist regime. Party policy was expressed more in the regulation of
artistic life than in academic research. Nevertheless there were specific
moments during Todor Zhivkov's rule (1953–85) when attempts to intro-
duce a liberalization of the Socialist system were made, while at the same
time protecting it from risks and disruption. The echo of free discussion
on subjects and themes, so far declared taboo, as well as criticism of vari-
ous tenets laid down by the Party, reached Bulgarian artists, writers and
musicians on a number of occasions.[28] It was felt, for example, in discus-
sions of the exhibitions of Polish posters, Renato Guttuso, and Mexican
art in the 1950s. Literary criticism and, later, art criticism raised the issue
of artistic quality and of stylistic and expressive freedom, as well as knowl-
edge of contemporary Western cultural trends. Attention was drawn to

---

[26] Atanas Boshkov, *Българската историческа живопис, т.I–II* (Sofia, 1972–78); Ata-
nas Boshkov and Asen Vasiliev, *Художественото наследство на манастира Зограф*
(Sofia, 1981); Boshkov, *Българската икона* (Sofia, 1984); Boshkov, *Изображенията на
Кирил и Методий през вековете* (Sofia, 1987).

[27] Ivanka Gergova, *Корпус на стенописите в България от XVIII век* (Sofia, 2006);
Emanuel Mutafov, Elena Genova, Ivanka Gergova, Dimitrios Gonis, Aleksander Kujum-
dziev, Elena Popova, *Гръцки зографи в България след 1453 г./ ΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ ΑΓΙΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ
ΣΤΗ ΒΟΥΛΓΑΡΙΑ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΟΥ 1453* (Sofia, 2008).

[28] See, Dimitar Avramov, 'За движението "Родно изкуство" в българската живопис',
Проблеми на изкуството 4 (1971) 5–27; Avramov, 'В търсене на национален стил.
Българското изкуство на границите между две епохи', in *Проблеми на сравнителното
литературознание* (Sofia, 1978) 264–321; Avramov, *Майстора и неговото време* (Sofia,
1989).

writers, artists and musicians, condemned earlier as 'decadent' or 'formalists'. The first National Youth Exhibition in 1961 saw the emergence of new young talents.[29] Cultural contacts with Western Europe were restored and Bulgaria became a member of international organizations. Bulgarian artists began to take part in major international art exhibitions, for instance in the Salon d'Automne in Paris.

The first radical attempt to place Bulgarian art from the beginning of the twentieth century in the context of European art was undertaken by Dimitar Avramov in his studies on the modernist *Rodno Izkoustvo* ('Art of the Motherland') movement and in a monograph on Vladimir Dimitrov Maistora (1882–1960), one of the greatest twentieth-century Bulgarian painters.[30] This significant period in the history of Bulgarian art, usually known as 'Bulgarian modernism' was viewed in a European context, and continues to be the subject of special attention by art historians.[31] It has been accompanied by a special interest in European Art Nouveau or the influence of Secessionism on the formation of similar phenomena in Bulgarian art, graphics and applied arts.[32] In 1978 the informative and popular journal *Promishlena Estetika i Dekorativno Izkoustvo* ('Industrial Aesthetics and Decorative Art') began to appear; avoiding any specific ideological aims, it seeks to examine 'the relationship of architectural space and elements of the environment from the position of their organic unity and the influence of that unity on the development of the elements'.[33]

Research into different aspects of Western European art also began to be published after 1956, a field in which Bulgarian scholars had no experience of their own or any tradition to draw on. Criticism or ideological

---

[29] Avramov, *Майстора и неговото време*, 20–37, 42–8, 50–74; 191–217; 167–298.

[30] 'Rodno Izkoustvo' was a movement in Bulgarian art which took shape at the beginning of the twentieth century and in 1919 created a society of the same name, similar to the 'Heimatkunstbewegung' in German-speaking countries. See, for example, Dimitar Avramov, 'За движението "Родно изкуство" в българскаат живопис', *Проблеми на изкуството* 4 (1971) 5–27; Avramov, 'В търсене на национален стил: Българското изкуство на границите между две епохи', *Проблеми на сравнителното литературознание* (Sofia, 1978) 264–321; Avramov, *Майстора и неговото време* (Sofia, 1989).

[31] Rusha Marinska, *20-те години в българското изобразително изкуство* (Sofia, 1996); Marinska, ed., *Sofia—Европа: Българската живопис (1900–1950) в контекста на европейското изкуство* (Sofia, 1999); Irina Genova and Tatiana Dimitrova, *Изкуството в България през 1920-те години: Модернизъм и национална идея* (Sofia, 2002); Rusha Marinska, ed., *Гео Милев и българският модернизъм* (Sofia, 2005).

[32] Svilen Stefanov, *Българският печат от 20-те години* (Sofia, 1994); Violeta Vasilchina, 'Приложното изкуство между "български стил", сецесиона и "родното"', *Из историята на българското изобразително изкуство* 3 (Sofia, 1992) 90–108.

[33] *Промишлена естетика и декоративно изкуство* 1 (Sofia, 1978).

polemic against the theoretical prerequisites of the various movements of Western art were considered mandatory, as was the case in the work of Atanas Stoikov, who wrote a number of hostile studies of abstract art.[34] However the most in-depth aesthetic and theoretical analysis of modern art in Western Europe was undertaken by Dimitar Avramov in his *Aesthetics of Modern Art* published in 1969 and his later study of Baudelaire.[35]

New methodological impulses made their impact felt in a number of fields. The analysis of various kinds of art and different historical periods called for the use of interdisciplinary approaches (including cultural anthropology, semiotics, structural semiotics and psychoanalysis). Ivan Marazov made use of the achievements of Lévi-Strauss's structural anthropology, in order to build up an original concept for Thracian art; he also defended the application of the tri-functional theory of Georges Dumézil to ancient Thracian society, some of whose postulates have subsequently been confirmed in relation to Scythian culture.[36]

In his book *Revival Period Church Woodcarving. A Semantic Analysis*, Valentin Angelov traced changes in the semantics of the different motifs, even their de-semantization, owing to the deformation of medieval canons and eventually changes in the worldview of the culture throughout this period.[37] In her study of the problem of 'art and society' in medieval Bulgaria Elka Bakalova aimed to present a reconstruction of the complex cultural context of the creation in literature and the visual arts of similar pictorial principles as the expression of a unified ideological and artistic concept.[38] Discussing the topical issue of the relation of 'word' and

---

[34] Atanas Stoikov, *Критика на абстрактното изкуство и неговите теории* (Sofia, 1963); Stoikov, *След заника на абстракционизма* (Sofia, 1970); Stoikov, *Изкуството на САЩ* (Sofia, 1983).

[35] Dimitar Avramov, *Естетика на модерното изкуство* (Sofia, 1969); Avramov, *Шарл Бодлер* (Sofia, 1985).

[36] Ivan Marazov, *Видимият мит: Изкуство и митология* (Sofia, 1992); Marazov, *Мит, ритуал и изкуство в древна Тракия* (Sofia, 1992); Marazov, *Митология на златото* (Sofia, 1994); Marazov, *Митология на траките* (Sofia 1994); Marazov, *Тракийският войн* (Sofia, 2005).

[37] Valentin Angelov, *Възрожденска църковна дърворезба: Семантичен анализ* (Sofia, 1986); Angelov, *Bulgarian Church Woodcarving 14th–19th Century* (Sofia, 2000); Angelov, *Самоковска възрожденска дърворезба* (Sofia, 2001).

[38] Elka Bakalova, 'Society and Art in Bulgaria in the 14th century', *Byzantinobulgarica* VIII (Sofia, 1986) 17–72; Bakalova, 'The Image of the Ideal Ruler in Medieval Bulgarian Literature and Art', in *Les cultes des saints guerriers et idéologie du pouvoir en Europe centrale et orientale*, ed. Ivan Biliarski and Radu Păun (Bucharest, 2007) 34–81; Bakalova, 'King David as a Model for the Christian Ruler: Some Visual Sources', in *Biblical Models of Power and Law/Modèles bibliques du pouvoir et de la loi*, ed. Ivan Biliarski and Radu Păun (Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Brussels, New York, Oxford and Vienna, 2008) 93–133.

'image', she examined the principles of visualization in different artistic and literary genres and structures, including biblical, historical and hymnographic texts.[39]

Alongside such projects the Institute for Fine Arts continued its work on themes connected to the sources, the formation and the specifics of Socialist art and culture. In its study of this question the Institute, with its director Alexander Obretenov, co-operated closely with Soviet theoreticians and art historians. This was expressed both in the organization of joint symposia and discussions, as well as publications with joint teams of authors such as the miscellany *The Formation and Development of Socialist Culture in Bulgaria*, brought out jointly with the Institute for Slavic Studies and Balkan Studies at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.[40]

During the long years of his rule Todor Zhivkov succeeded in changing the emphasis from Socialist internationalism towards moderate nationalism. In the cultural policy of the 1970s his daughter Ljudmila Zhivkova, Chairman of the Committee for Culture, was a prominent figure. She promoted activities that stressed national originality, and popularized the achievements of Bulgarian culture abroad and achievements of world significance in Bulgaria. Representative exhibitions of Thracian treasures, Bulgarian icons and contemporary Bulgarian art were organized. Thracian art was given particular prominence, because while the Bulgarians were descended from a combination of Slavic and Turkic migrants, there had also been, since the nineteenth century, suggestions of continuity with the Thracians of antiquity.[41] Even an Institute of Thracian Studies (today the Alexander Fol Centre of Thracian Studies) was created under the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences by Alexander Fol, who had close links to Ljudmila Zhivkova; it began to organize conferences on Thracian studies, the first in Sofia in 1972. These activities, together with the sensational discoveries of Thracian underground tombs and murals all stimulated their study.

---

[39] Elka Bakalova, 'Житиеписно повествование и изобразителна интерпретация', *Старобългарска литература* 25–26 (Sofia, 1991) 173–87; Bakalova, 'Hymnography and Iconography: Images of Hymnographers in the Mural Art of the 12th–13th centuries in Bulgaria', in *Ritual and Art: Byzantine Essays for Christopher Walter*, ed. Pamela Armstrong (London, 2006) 246–73; Bakalova, 'Principles of Visualization of the Pseudo-Canonical Texts in the Art of the Byzantine Commonwealth', *Biblia Slavorum Apocryphorum: Novum Testamentum. Materiały z Międzynarodowej Konferencji Naukowej* (Łódź, 2009) 167–89.

[40] Aleksandar Obretenov, *Формиране и развитие на социалистическата култура в България* (Sofia, 1971).

[41] This was first suggested by Marin Drinov and Josef Konstantin Jireček, *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Prague, 1876) and further developed by many others. See Dimitar Avramov, *Образуване на българската народност* (Sofia, 1971).

Within Bulgarian art history the work of Ivan Marazov constitutes a watershed between the historical and archaeological studies of his predecessors and the adoption of new methodologies in the study of art history. His works dealt with principles of the visualization of the mythological concepts of the Thracians, and sought connections with fine art, as well as the ritual function of the sites themselves, together with the analysis of the ideology of kingship in ancient Thrace.[42]

The grandiose ending of this episode in the history of Bulgarian culture was the solemn commemoration in 1981 of the 1300th anniversary of the founding of the Bulgarian state with exhibitions, conferences and series of lectures in various countries across Europe and the United States. This opening of Bulgarian culture to the world was largely due to the influence of Ljudmila Zhivkova; her ambitions exceeded what was practicable, however, and also involved major financial commitments. Therefore after her death in 1981 most of these projects were abandoned.[43] The first decade after the successive changes of the political regime in 1989 reflected the inertia accumulated from the previous years. In 1991 the journal *Industrial Aesthetics and Decorative Arts* was renamed *Industrial Design/Decorative Art*, but in the course of the same year publication ceased. Specialists turned towards presenting their accumulated research in separate publications, monographs and catalogues; this fragmentation was the consequence of the lack of time to adapt to the new conditions and the absence of centres that could offer guidance and coherence.

A major subject of debate in this era concerned the relationship of Bulgaria to Europe, and the related problem of the relation of Bulgarian to European art. The primary question of how to become aligned with Western culture without losing Bulgarian national identity was still topical after the political changes of 1989. The solution was to emphasize 'Bulgarian contributions' to European civilization in all periods of its history while, on the other, to study the association with 'European values' or the process of 'Europeanization' in various spheres of Bulgarian culture.[44] In some cases these issues have been studied jointly by Bulgarian scholars

---

[42] Ivan Marazov, *Мит, ритуал и изкуство у траките* (Sofia, 1992); Marazov, *Видимият мит: Изкуство и митология* (Sofia, 1992); Marazov, ed., *Ancient Gold: The Wealth of the Thracians: Treasures from the Republic of Bulgaria* (New York, 1998).

[43] Evgeniya Kalinova and Iskra Baeva, *Българските преходи (1939–2002)* (Sofia, 2002) 175–218.

[44] See Atanas Boshkov, *Български приноси в европейската* цивилизация (Sofia, 1994); Emanuel Mutafov, *Европеизация на* хартия, (Sofia, 2001).

and colleagues from Western Europe. An interesting joint German-Bulgarian project, aiming to bring out the building of the image of Europe in Southeastern Europe, with a focus on Bulgaria, entitled *Foreign Europe? The Image of Self and Conceptions of Europe in Bulgaria (1850–1945)* was a case in point.[45] Another example was the exhibition and conference on the topic *Bulgarian Painters in Munich. Modern Practices from the Mid-Nineteenth to the Mid-Twentieth Century* held in 2008 on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the Akademie der Bildende Künste in Munich.[46] Studies of Islamic art in the Balkans and the art of the Islamic minorities in Bulgaria have also appeared.[47]

Regardless of the difficulties of the transition towards democracy and a market economy in Bulgaria after the change of government in 1989–91, the new ideological freedom was an undoubtedly significant factor, although the attitude of the authorities to the problems of culture veered towards total indifference. This new freedom was reflected above all in the development of modern art, in the evolution of non-conventional forms and the appearance of installation, which in turn were accompanied by the emergence of their own ideologists and critics. 'The fall of the totalitarian regime' writes the art historian Svilen Stefanov 'allowed artists to do whatever they wished, without taking into account the external views of authorities and institutions.'[48] The natural consequence of this process was the fact that the National Art Academy, which in 2006 celebrated the 110th Anniversary of its foundation, also became a major centre of art studies in the first decade of the twenty-first century. The changed landscape of contemporary art has also led to considerable quantities of research. Since 2002 a number of important conferences have been held on contemporary Bulgarian art in all its varieties and a series of anthologies edited by Chavdar Popov and Svilen Stefanov have been published.[49]

---

[45] Petar Petrov, Katerina Gehl, and Klaus Roth, eds., *Fremdes Europa? Selbstbilder und Europa-Vorstellungen in Bulgarien (1850–1945)* (Berlin, 2007).

[46] Anelia Nikolaeva and Denitsa Kiseler, *Българските художници и Мюнхен: Модерни практики от средата на XIX до средата на XX век*: Каталог (Sofia, 2009).

[47] Mikhaila Stainova, Османско изкуство на Балканите: XV–XVIII век. (Sofia, 1995); Lyubomir Mikov, Култова архитектура и изкуство на хетеродоксните мюсюлмани в България (XVI–XX век): Бекташи и къзълбаши (Sofia, 2007).

[48] Svilen Stefanov, 'Динамика на художествените модели в съвременното българско изкуство', *Проблеми на* изкуството 1 (1998) 3.

[49] Chavdar Popov and Svilen Stefanov, eds., *Between Traditions and Innovations: The Bulgarian Art of the 90s* (Sofia, 2003) (bilingual); Popov and Stefanov, Съвременната българска живопис: Между локалното и глобалното (Sofia, 2004).

The authors of the contributions are specialists in various different fields, including art historians, artists, and journalists as well as post-graduate students from the National Art Academy, making the anthologies collections of interdisciplinary work.

Art history has also been established as a subject of study at the National Academy of Art; in 1995 an Art Studies programme was included at the New Bulgarian University within the History of Culture department. Education in the History of Art in the National Academy of Art offers training in visual arts and provides courses on modern aesthetic theories and artistic practices, with special emphasis on the study of the monuments of Bulgarian and world culture. Some ten students of art history graduate each year with a Master's degree and then continue either to undertake research or to work as museum and gallery curators, art critics and art editors in specialized publications and cultural institutions, as experts in visual arts, managers, or professional teachers of the history of art in comprehensive secondary schools and specialized high schools of art. The discipline itself provides opportunities for research mentorship of doctoral students in the theory and history of fine arts and allows for further specialization in these fields. The National Academy of Art has a successful partnership with the Cité internationale des Arts in Paris, and also participates in the LLP-Erasmus exchange of students and teaching staff. Today, almost all Bulgarian art historians of the middle and younger generation are graduates of the National Academy of Art. In 2010 the Academy began to bring out a new journal called *Art and Critics*, the aim of which, according to the editorial board, is 'the scientific and critical interpretation of topical issues in the visual arts'.

In the course of the past decade all areas of Bulgarian art studies have been developing comparatively evenly, with improved chances for specialization abroad, which have also allowed artists to keep abreast of international tendencies. The practical possibilities for communication, active contacts and correspondence with similar institutions abroad, and the increased exchange of information, has exerted an influence both on the problems addressed and the methodology of art-historical study. Naturally, research into the artistic heritage of the Bulgarian lands continues. What is new, however, is the emphasis on artistic processes connected with the domination of totalitarian regimes in European countries. A fine example in this respect is Chavdar Popov's *Totalitarian Art. Ideology. Organization. Practice*, the very title of which indicates the socio-political context of

the artistic phenomena examined.[50] This book is an in-depth historical and theoretical study, an attempt to examine the most essential trends in painting, sculpture and partly architecture in countries with a totalitarian regime (the Soviet Union, Germany, and Italy) between the 1930s and the 1950s, on a comparative 'East-West' basis. The younger generation of Bulgarian art historians has also turned to this subject; particular interest was shown in a doctoral thesis recently defended, *Between the Desired and the Actual: Photography and Visual Propaganda in Bulgaria 1948–1956*, dealing with the role of photography in the Socialist press, the specifics of realism in Socialist photography and its use of set compositional formulae.[51] As Socialist Realism called for attention to the semiotic dimension of art, which photographers had to take into consideration, photography began to depart greatly from its indexical function. The study of Socialist photography thus also allowed for the examination of 'the other existence' of the photographic image, its semiotic pluralism and depth of meanings.

The examination of Bulgarian art of the last two decades and debates on its development continue to remain highly topical. The debates are connected with the need to elucidate and outline important theoretical issues as well as the socio-cultural context of the emergence of the new forms in art. Svilen Stefanov has dedicated his book to the problem of the *Avant-Garde and Norm. Innovative Tendencies in Bulgarian Art from the End of the 20th Century*.[52] Special attention has also been given to the phenomenon of postmodernism, some authors emphasizing the relation of pluralism to the wider postmodern situation in Bulgaria and the Balkans.[53] One recent book, regarded as perhaps the most significant study on the subject within the Institute for Art Studies, was *Postmodernism and Bulgarian Art in the 1980s and the 1990s*.[54] In this text postmodernism is examined on a global basis: 'The symmetrical collapse of the two

---

[50] Chavdar Popov, *Тоталитарното изкуство: Идеология: Организация: Практика* (Sofia, 2004).

[51] Katerina Gadzheva, *Между желаното и действителното: фотографията и 'нагледна агитация' в България 1948–1956* (PhD Dissertation, Sofia, 2010).

[52] Svilen Stefanov, *Авангард и Норма: Иновационни тенденции в българското изкуство от края на XX век* (Sofia, 2003).

[53] See, for example, Irina Genova, *Модернизми и модерност (не възможност за историзиране: Изкуство в България и художествен обмен с балканските страни* (Sofia, 2004).

[54] Chavdar Popov, *Постмодернизмът и българското изкуство от 80-те-90-те години н XX век* (Sofia, 2009).

great Utopias—of communism in the East and of technical progress in the West' writes Popov, 'has logically led to the rise of comparable, though not homogenous moods and perceptions in world art'.[55]

Today the discipline of art history stands at a crossroads; it is at a moment of re-examination and critical re-assessment of the main principles of academic study. As Hans Belting has suggested, not only are certain aspects of traditional art-historical discourse 'no longer fashionable', they might even simply cease to exist.[56] Essential parts of Belting's work, as well as texts by other authors connected with the re-assessment of such terms as 'period', 'context', 'artwork', 'representation', and 'interpretation' have come out in translation in Bulgarian, and thus opened up the discussion for those interested in these problems.[57] Art history has aimed at the constant renewal and improvement of its *instrumenta studiorum.* Present-day Bulgarian art historians are also participants in this process.

---

[55] Popov, *Постмодернизмът и българското*, 160.
[56] Hans Belting, *Art History after Modernism*, trans. Caroline Saltzwedel, Mitch Cohen and Kenneth Northcott (Chicago, IL, 2003).
[57] Irina Genova and Angel Angelov, *Следистории на изкуството* (Sofia, 2001).

ART HISTORY IN THE CZECH AND SLOVAK REPUBLICS: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS, TOPICS AND LOYALTIES[1]

Milena Bartlová

This sketch of art history in the Czech and Slovak Republics starts by following the trajectory of newcomers to the field. Entering the system by enrolling for art history at university, about three quarters of the students will be women, but women remain rare amongst those who succeed in acquiring tenured and senior positions. Young people attending university will have been born during the last years of what was Czechoslovakia between 1918 and 1992 (with a hiatus during the war years of 1939–1945). While educated Slovaks can read and understand Czech fairly well, young Czechs will have much more difficulty in understanding Slovak. Since the two nations split into separate states in 1993, mutual language competence has declined—a far cry from the 1920s, when the idea of a single Czechoslovak nation served as the foundation of the state created on the ruins of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

   The historical memories of Czechs and Slovaks emerged from quite different historical backgrounds. Historically, Slovakia was part of Hungary, while the land that eventually became the Czech Republic had a long history as an important kingdom within the Holy Roman Empire, consisting of Bohemia, Moravia and extensive regions of Silesia and Lusatia (now parts of Poland and Germany) from the tenth until the eighteenth century. These facts of history, together with the mixed ethnic character of both parts of Czechoslovakia, informed their art-historical traditions. The history of art in Slovakia was subsumed within that of Hungary up to 1918, when a completely new system of art-historical institutions was programmatically designed and implemented by the Czechs, who assumed the role of 'elder brother' in the common state. Their own art-historical traditions and institutions, having their beginnings in the middle of the nineteenth century, have been strongly influenced by the presence—and,

after 1945, enforced absence—of a German-speaking intellectual and cultural environment.[2]

Czech or Slovak students of art history normally do not go far from home. Art history is taught at universities, art academies and polytechnics, although only the major universities (Prague, Brno and Olomouc; Bratislava and Trnava) have post-graduate programmes and the right to appoint new professors. It is also taught in new regional universities, established in the 1990s, in Ostrava, Opava, Ústí nad Labem and České Budějovice. In the Czech Republic, about 2,000 young people apply each year to study art history, with fewer than 25% accepted for Bachelor's studies; approximately 100 students then continue on to undertake Master's degrees. In Slovakia, the numbers are close to fifty students accepted every year for Bachelor's study, and twenty for Master's. Of the universities, only Charles University in Prague predates the 1920s and, accordingly, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, art history was developed only there. The university, founded in 1348, split into separate Czech- and German-speaking institutions in 1882. Art history was first taught in 1846 by Professor Johann E. Wocel (1802–1871) in the Department of Archaeology, and the first Chair of Art History was given to Alfred Woltmann (1841–1880) in 1874, Prague having one of the first seven chairs in the discipline in German-speaking countries before 1880.[3] Wocel sided with the Czech national emancipation movement, while Woltmann, a co-founder of the first professional art-historical journal, *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, was a decided German nationalist. His public lecture on 'German art in Prague' provoked street riots, and his claim that the Slavic names of supposed Czech medieval painters were fabrications, initiated a long-running topic in Czech art history, namely the national, ethnic or even racial origins of local artists.

Attention to the issue of nationality also provides a means of tracking changes in predominant methodologies. During the second half of the nineteenth century, the topic was pursued in terms of linguistic analyses of individual personal names recorded in written sources. When students

---

[2] Rostislav Švácha, ed., *Kapitoly z českých dějin umění* (Prague, 1986); Anděla Horová, ed., *Nová encyklopedie českého výtvarného umění* (Prague, 1995); Ján Bakoš, *Situácia dejepisu umenia na Slovensku: Prolegomena* (Bratislava, 1984), Milena Bartlová, *Naše, národní umění* (Brno 2009). In internationally accessible languages (concerning the interwar period only) see Michaela Marek, 'Kunstgeschichte zwischen Wissenschaft und Dienst am Staat', in *Grenzen überwindend: Festschrift für Adam S. Labuda*, ed. Katja Bernhardt and Piotr Piotrowski (Berlin, 2006) 79–97.

[3] Johann E. Wocel, *Grundzüge der böhmischen Altertumskunde* (Prague, 1845).

of Alois Riegl and Max Dvořák (himself a Czech national, who opted, however, for Austria after the break), came to occupy all the positions of the art-historical establishment of the new Czechoslovak Republic after 1918, this preference was suspended in favour of the ideology of a unified Czechoslovak nation, which covered up the multi-national reality of the state. The prominence of 'Gestalt' methodology in both German Nazi and Czech art history in the 1940s led to clashing claims to the German, or Slavo-Czech identity of the state's entire artistic heritage. Following the expulsion of the Germans from Czechoslovakia in 1945–47, art history was purged of any relationship to art in German-speaking countries. Sources of 'artistic influence' were found directly in Italy or France. The inclusion of Czech and Slovak lands in the Habsburg Empire was neglected; the artistic heritage of the predominantly German-speaking historical lands of Silesia and Lusatia was disowned, and a national Czech tradition of nineteenth-century painting was constructed which omitted reference to artists' studies at the Munich or Vienna academies. In Slovakia, art history never participated in the struggle for national emancipation—one of the main reasons being the presence of a powerful Reformed Calvinist tradition among some leading Slovak patriots.[4] Thus, the national identity of artistic heritage became a topic only during the period of the wartime fascist Slovak state.

Thanks to the democratic character of the interwar Czechoslovak Republic, both countries were lucky to evade the more virulent forms of Eastern European nationalism. Nevertheless, the national paradigm of history has become so pervasive in both Czech and Slovak societies, informing school curricula and shared historical memories, as to be perceived as completely natural and rarely addressed clearly and openly. The eleven-volume grand narrative of Czech art history, published in Prague from 1984 to 2007 never considers inclusion of the Czech nation in a larger state, whether the medieval Bohemian kingdom, the Holy Roman and Habsburg Empires, or Czechoslovakia.[5] It entirely relies on the notion of the Czech nation and its visual arts as an ethnic, or linguistic unit. This concept is clearly informed by the demands of state politics. The project for the publication of an authoritative Slovak art history, which was devised only after the establishment of the independent state in 1993, is framed by

---

4 Ján Bakoš, *Periféria a symbolický skok* (Bratislava, 2000) 151–64.
5 Rudolf Chadraba and Rostislav Švácha, eds., *Dějiny českého výtvarného umění*, 6 vols. (Prague, 1984–2007).

current state borders; the authors demarcate Slovak from both Hungarian and Czechoslovak art.[6] Curiously, a narrative of art history in the state of Czechoslovakia, framed by the rhetoric of a 'Czechoslovak' nation at odds with the multi-ethnic reality was not written until 1937, when the very existence of the state was threatened, and it had little impact.[7] The artistic heritage of both countries continues to be habitually included in art histories of either Germany or Hungary (but not of Austria).

One of the distinctive features of Czech and Slovak scholarship is an exclusive reliance on topics of local artistic heritage and an almost total evasion of writing on art history outside the country. This may be strange to outsiders, but it is deeply rooted in the national paradigm governing any historical interest, paired with a virtual absence in both countries of artworks pertaining to the European art-historical canon. The sole survey of 'general' art history was written in the 1920s (an abridged edition was published in 1948).[8] Otherwise, readers' demands have been satisfied by translations of texts by foreign authors.

The nationally defined framework of Czech and Slovak art history is implicit and rarely becomes the subject of open discussion. The prevailing methodological traditions were forged by the Vienna School of art history. Czech, Slovak, Hungarian and Austrian art historians thus have a shared background, which in one sense made the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and subsequent creation of new national states invisible in art-historical discourse. The key historical turning point was instead seen as being the introduction of scientific, i.e. Viennese, methods to the discipline. Positions in the Czechoslovak art-historical establishment were occupied from the 1920s onwards by peers of the second generation of Vienna scholars, sharing with these the belief in the universal development of art (*ars una*), which disguised a nationalization of art-historical discourse. Indeed, the introduction of the national and racial paradigm was visible in the work of other Vienna School scholars such as Hans

---

[6] Ivan Rusina and Zora Rusinová, eds., *Dejiny slovenského výtvarného umenia: Barok* (Bratislava, 1998); Zora Rusinová, Ján Ábelovský, Katarína Bajcurová, Vladimír Beskid, Dana Bořutová, Matúš Dulla, Jana Geržová, Aurel Hrabušický, Silvia Ilečková, and Beata Jablonská, eds., *20. storočie* (Bratislava, 2000); Dušan Buran, Luďka Kratochvílová, and Irena Kucharová, eds., *Gotika* (Bratislava, 2003); Ivan Rusina, Alexandra Homoľová, Irena Kuchárová, Mária Riháková (eds.), Renesancia, umenie mezi neskorou gotikou a barokom (Bratislava 2009).

[7] Zdeněk Wirth, ed., *Československá vlastivěda*, vol. 6 (Prague, 1935) 5–322.

[8] Antonín Matějček, *Dějiny umění*, 6 vols. (Prague, 1922–36); Antonín Matějček, *Dějiny umění v obrysech* (Prague, 1948).

Sedlmayr or Dagobert Frey.[9] This common intellectual heritage allowed for complete continuity during the Second World War and the post-war years, despite the upheavals suffered by the Czechoslovak state. The Chair at Prague University (reduced to a German-language institution during the years of the Nazi occupation) was held by Karl M. Swoboda (1889–1977), a Viennese scholar, who occupied the Chair in Vienna after the war, when German art history in Prague was, in turn, abolished. The Czech universities were forcibly closed during the war, but after 1945 lecturers and professors reclaimed their positions without difficulty. The Slovak situation mirrored that of Prague: one wartime representative of art history at Bratislava University, Jozef Cincík (1909–1992), went into political exile, while Vladimír Wagner (1900–1955) and Alžbeta Güntherová-Mayerová (1905–1973) continued on to become the founders of modern Slovak art history.

Following the Communist coup in 1948, ideological streamlining along the lines of Soviet Marxism forced several prominent art historians to retreat from the universities to museums, state heritage institutions, or the state Academy of Sciences, newly established as a pure research institute. Only two art historians, Josef Zvěřina (1913–1990) and the first female professor Růžena Vacková (1901–1982), were victims of the Stalinist incarcerations, both because of their allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church. The smoothness of the ideological turn was further helped by a strong personal continuity with the pre-war Czech art-historical field. This was personified in Antonín Matějček (1889–1950) and Zdeněk Wirth (1878–1961), who achieved positions of power in the new Communist establishment. Thanks to a general prevalence of leftist thinking in Czechoslovak intellectual and artistic circles, Communism was also embraced by independent personalities such as Vincenc Kramář (1877–1960), famous for his Picasso collection. A more rigorous Marxist-Leninist approach in art history was, of course, employed by the young generation, who used the situation after the Communist coup for quick personal advancement. The best of them, however, remained among the leading art historians after adopting more liberal approaches during the 1960s, including Jaromír Neumann (1924–2001), Karel Stejskal (b.1931), Rudolf Chadraba (1922–2011) and Marian Váross

---

9 See Ján Bakoš, 'From Universalism to Nationalism: Transformation of Vienna School Ideas in Central Europe', in *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der nationale Diskurs*, ed. Robert Born (Berlin, 2004) 79–102; Maria Theisen, ed., *Wiener Schule: Erinnerung und Perspektiven; Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 53 (2004).

(1923–1988).[10] Still, the 'dogmatic' episode left negative traces in the ensu-
ing general orientation of Czech and Slovak art history, which prolonged
the post-war methodological 'restraint' up to the end of the twentieth
and even into the twenty-first century. A neo-positivist and descriptive
approach was, and continues to be, regarded as an effective antidote to
politically engaged methodologies that might jeopardize the personal
integrity of researchers by serving the politics of a totalitarian state.

The fiction of a morally safe and scientifically objective position enabled
concentrated studies of historical periods, while art history of the modern
era together with contemporary art criticism was much more vulnerable
to ideological enforcement. Indeed it was in the latter sphere that one can
also recognize dissident activity and engagement in the 'parallel culture'
in the writing of Jindřich Chalupecký (1910–1990) or Radislav Matuštík
(1929–2006).[11] More theoretically adventurous efforts in the officially
approved space were minimized, mostly as an understandable strategy to
safeguard whatever matter-of-fact research was being pursued. More open
thinking was possible only on the margins: Václav Mencl (1905–1978)[12]
returned to his pre-war work in Slovakia in order to escape the ideological
pressures in Prague in the early 1950s; during the 1960s, the philosopher
Jan Patočka was influential on Václav Richter (1900–1970) in Brno and
Olomouc.[13] Amongst younger scholars, this phenomenologically-inspired
work was pursued rather more by exiles such as Dalibor Veselý (b. 1934)
or Tomáš Štrauss (b. 1931).[14] The tradition of Czech structuralism informs
the ideas of Ján Bakoš (b. 1943), whose teaching efforts in Bratislava
have helped to install methodology as a legitimate art-historical topic in
Slovakia.[15] In contrast, Czech art-historical discourse remains much more
immune to any attempts at theorizing.

---

[10] Key works include: Jaromír Neumann, *Die Gemäldegalerie der Prager Burg* (Prague,
1964); Neumann, *Das böhmische Barock* (Prague, 1970); Neumann, ed., *Renaissance Art in
Bohemia* (Prague, 1979); Karel Stejskal, *Karl IV. und die Kultur und Kunst seiner Zeit* (Prague,
1978); Rudolf Chadraba, *Dürers Apokalypse: Eine ikonologische Deutung* (Prague, 1964).

[11] Jindřich Chalupecký, 'Marcel Duchamp: a re-evaluation', *Artibus et historiae* 6 (1985)
125–36; Chalupecký, 'Les ready-made de Duchamp et la théorie du symbole', *Artibus et
historiae* 7 (1986) 153–63.

[12] Václav Mencl, *Česká architektura doby Lucemburské* (Prague, 1948); Mencl, *Lidová
architektura v Československu* (Prague, 1980).

[13] Václav Richter, 'Die Anfänge der grossmährischen Architektur', *Magna Moravia*
(Prague, 1965) 121–358; Richter, *Umění a svět* (Prague, 2000).

[14] Dalibor Veselý, *Architecture in the Age of Divided Representation: The Question of Cre-
ativity in the Shadow of Production* (Cambridge, MA, 2004).

[15] Ján Bakoš, *Dejiny a koncepcie stredovekého umenia na Slovensku: Explikácia na
gotickom nástennom maliarstve* (Bratislava, 1984).

Such methodological and theoretical abstinence supported the idea of a Czechoslovak art-historical tradition emanating from Max Dvořák's concerns both with 'strictly scientific' art history and also with art history as 'Geistesgeschichte' or the history of ideas. Formal criticism dominates medieval research and iconological Baroque studies. Other approaches, including sociology, semiotics or communication studies have only begun to gain more space in the fields of the Bohemian Renaissance, Mannerism and the eighteenth century, Moravian art (which was remarkably different from that of Bohemia) and in nineteenth-century art, where art history has only slowly left behind the entrenched tradition of a patriotic discourse of the 'Czech National Resurgence'.[16] Self-reflexive inquiry into the discipline itself remains rare in Czech and Slovak art history. For example, the role of religion in art and, more specifically, in art-historical discourse, is never addressed, although it played a significant role both in Marxist critiques and in defences against them; it remains to the present a pertinent, though submerged, topic especially in research into the medieval and Baroque periods. National identities in both art and art history are likewise not discussed. In accord with the general mood there is also a lack of interest in the specific contribution of the forty years of scholarship under the Communist regime. Purely 'factual' research in premodern art is hailed as scientifically objective and reliable, while most writing on modern and contemporary art produced under the previous régime is dismissed out of hand. Particular methodological contributions remain unexplored, even though inspiring ideas can be found not only in the phenomenology of Václav Richter, but also in what appears to have been a specific Marxist inspired iconology.[17]

Most art historians participate at least marginally in debates on contemporary art, but there is a significant split in working methods, institutional networks and intellectual orientation between historians of art on the one hand, and curators, critics and theoreticians on the other at the level of post-graduate education. For both groups, exhibitions are an important medium of art-historical and theoretical research. While in the last decade the National Gallery in Prague has opted for exhibitions addressed to a general audience drawing relatively large numbers of visitors from a traditionally oriented public, the Slovak National Gallery in

[16] On Mannerism see Pavel Preiss, *Panoráma manýrismu* (Prague, 1974). On the eighteenth century, see Jiří Kroupa, *Alchymie štěstí* (Brno, 1984; second edn. 2006).
[17] See, for example, Josef Krása, *Die Handschriften König Wenzels IV.* (Prague, 1971).

Bratislava, or the Moravian Gallery in Brno interlace a similar approach with more audacious projects, including reviewing the art of the 1970s and 1980s under the *ancien régime*, or rediscovering marginalized female artists of the twentieth century. Major loans from abroad have been apparent only in some projects on Gothic and Baroque art during the last fifteen years. One has to go to Berlin, Vienna or Munich to see important loan exhibitions. Private galleries exhibiting foreign artists are rare (Jiří Švestka in Prague), although art dealers have proliferated with rising numbers of collectors. The market is, however, mostly oriented towards Czech and Slovak painters of the art nouveau and classical modern periods.

The buying policies of the major state institutions are inhibited by unsatisfactory funding even more clearly than their exhibitions are. Public funds were strained after 1989 by the need to pay for artworks in museums that had been legally restituted to their rightful owners following the demise of the Communist regime. The depletion of many churches, the contents of which were looted and illegally exported during the 1990s may have been an inevitable price for the new freedom of travel. Both states have since relied more on legislation and enforced limitations of owners' rights than on market strategies to keep important items of artistic heritage in the country. Finally, the specific Czech and Slovak school of restoration and conservation should be mentioned, although there is progressively less space for scholars in the restoration process; the latter functions on the premise that a restorer is first and foremost an artist, who 'meets his historical counterpart inside the fabric of the restored image'. As with the restoration of buildings, the 'analytic' approach, developed in line with Czech and Slovak structuralism, has receded in favour of renovation in recent decades.[18]

Returning to the trajectory of the aspiring art historians, they will conclude their studies with a thesis on art or architecture in the Czech or Slovak Republic (foreign art is rarely if ever assigned as topic). Before 2010, approximately 15% of Czech art history graduates—about 30% in Slovakia—remained in the field.[19] Employment opportunities for art

---

[18] Zuzana Bauerová, 'A Critical Reflection on Czechoslovak Conservation-Restoration, its Theory and Methodological Approach', in *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas, and Uncomfortable Truths*, ed. Alison Richmond and Alison Bracker (Amsterdam and London, 2009) 113–24.

[19] Neither Czech nor Slovak universities survey the statistics of their graduates' careers, nor are there available statistics of employment patterns in the field; these numbers thus remain a qualified guess.

historians vary widely—ranging from secondary school teaching and the local or national civil service, to museums or pure research; the first Roman-Catholic diocese museum was opened in 2006 in Olomouc to be followed by Brno, České Budějovice and Plzeň. A total of some 800 persons are active in art history in the Czech and Slovak Republics taken together. Freelance curators and writers are typical of the contemporary art scene; the number of educated art historians in galleries is growing steadily. The nearly complete divorce between art historians and antiquities dealers remains a curious legacy of the Communist regime. The area with the most applied art-historical practice is the developed system of state heritage institutions. Museum curators are not expected to rank among important researchers, although the National Gallery in Prague used to be a key exception under the Communists, when a number of intellectuals and art historians found relative shelter there under the auspices of its long-time director Jiří Kotalík (1920–1996). Besides university departments, the key establishments are the Institutes for Art History at the Czech and Slovak Academies of Sciences, a specific type of state institution devoted solely to research. The Czech Institute published the authoritative 'grand narrative' of Czech art history and the ongoing, multi-volume Indexes of Artistic Heritage.[20] Slovak Heritage Indexes were completed in the 1970s, while publication of a comprehensive and authoritative history of art in Slovakia started only after 1993; financed by the state, it is realized as series of publications accompanying exhibitions staged by the National Gallery in Bratislava.

Approximately thirty-five Czech graduates (fewer than five in Slovakia) commence doctoral research annually, usually at the same university where they completed their first degree. Doctoral study overseas remains rare, as do prolonged study trips abroad. The main reason for this rather closed system is a total lack of financial support for Czech and Slovak students. Most postgraduate students have to finance their studies through employment, and the difference in currency values often rules out foreign study. There is only one single privately financed scholarship opportunity, offered by the American chemist and collector Alfred Bader, restricted, though, to Czech students of seventeenth-century painting. Labour legislation in both countries excludes the possibility of working without a salary,

---

[20] Bohumil Samek, *Umělecké památky Moravy a Slezska*, 2 vols. of 3 planned (Prague, 1994 and 1999); Pavel Vlček, Růžena Baťková, and Dalibor Prix, eds., *Umělecké památky Prahy*, 4 vols. (Prague, 1996–2000).

which makes voluntary work, as in the German system of 'voluntary employees', impossible.

Completed doctoral dissertations do not have to be published, but the best of them have found their way to press in recent years. There is increasing pressure to publish with the introduction of scientometric evaluation systems in state-financed research and academic institutions. A substantial group of scholars now in their fifties or sixties has managed to evade the strict regulations applied to the younger generation. As the acquisition of a PhD equivalent, not to mention a professorship, required political loyalty to the Communist regime, many managed to secure positions in the current art-historical establishment without them. The younger generation today is required to show a level of productivity comparable to that of established traditions in Western Europe. Despite the numerous publication possibilities, most art-historical writing is published in Czech or Slovak, which makes it easily accessible—outside the two republics—only to Polish readers. German and Hungarian researchers all too often regard these publications as *non leguntur*, even when writing about Czech or Slovak art.

The closed character of Czech and Slovak art history served the censoring needs of the Communist regime, but has, since 1989, increasingly become one of the main factors inhibiting the development of the discipline. Although a standard knowledge of research in the leading world languages is expected of younger scholars, their attempts at participating in wider debates are often compromised as a result of their being overlooked by European and American colleagues. This may be reciprocated by the distancing attitude of the older generation of Czech and Slovak researchers who often had little opportunity to learn foreign languages to a sufficient level. Thus, new attributions, precise dating, or the discovery of hitherto unknown or undervalued objects are considered the best achievements, while new interpretations or the application of current theoretical approaches would be received with caution and may easily be dismissed by the art-historical establishment. The main barriers to the future development of Czech and Slovak art history can be identified as traditionalism, a closed institutional system and linguistic barriers, but, on the other hand, the tasks and agendas that offer themselves are extremely inviting. The inclusion of the Czech and Slovak Republics within the unified Europe and the wider growth of interest in the art of countries outside its centre present a challenge that should galvanize some of the most promising young intellectuals.

ART HISTORY IN FRANCE: A CONFLICT OF TRADITIONS

Ralph Dekoninck and Joël Roucloux

Translated by Matthew Rampley

> Could art history be affected by doubt? Today this discipline, which so
> superbly rejected the world, with a disdain based on the aura of its object,
> is accused, even from amongst its own ranks, of having refused to open up
> for too long, of having rejected debate, critique and renewal.[1]

It is with these words that Laurence Bertrand Dorléac began her report
on the state of art history in France in the mid-1990s, an article that draws
a pessimistic picture of the state of the discipline in the country. This
account was all the more remarkable for having come from the margins of
art history, since Bertrand Dorléac is an historian and her article appeared
in a history journal. But at this very moment, doubt had spread across
the field of art history, as was attested to by the results of an inquiry pub-
lished some years earlier in one of the main general intellectual reviews
in France, *Le Débat*, under the title: 'Where has art history come to in
France?' ('Où en est l'histoire de l'art en France?').[2] It emerged from this
that art history was accused of being behind the times in comparison with
the situation in other countries.

  Not wishing to pass our own judgement on the state of the discipline
in the country, we shall settle with seeking to understand the reasons for
this 'crisis' and, furthermore, its origins. This is the reason we pay par-
ticular attention to what appears to be characteristic of the discipline in
France, namely, the confluence, which can also turn into conflict, of three
traditions. The first is drawn from the world of art criticism; the second
depends on the domain of the university, and the third tradition emerged
in the museum world, where it continues. Starting with an outline of
the principal stakes involved in a certain fragmentation of the discipline

---

[1] Laurence Bertrand Dorléac, 'L'histoire de l'art et les cannibales', *Vingtième siècle* 45
(1995) 99.
[2] 'Où en est l'histoire de l'art en France?' *Le Débat* 65 (1991) 182–233. The personali-
ties interviewed included: Jean-Paul Bouillon, Françoise Cachin, Philippe Dagen, Hubert
Damisch, Pierre Georgel, Stéphane Guégan, Elisabeth Lebovici, François Loyer, Alain
Mérot, Pierre Rosenberg, Antoine Schnapper and Pierre Vaisse.

between these three sites and approaches in art discourse, we shall then observe them within a specific research field, namely, the study of modern art; this field appears as a laboratory in which this conflict of traditions is clearly revealed. We are deliberately leaving to one side other aspects or, indeed, other debates, such as those concerned with national artistic identity (the debate on the existence of the French 'primitifs', or of a French Renaissance, or a French Baroque), even though these questions could equally well have been addressed as interesting foci of historiographic and epistemological observation.[3]

As a point of departure, let us return to the sense of crisis attested to by various writings in the 1990s, and which stood in contrast to the health of the art world as well as the infatuation of the public with heritage and with exhibitions in general. Critics saw a discipline that was, essentially, turned in on itself, holding on to an autonomy thought to be pure of all admixtures, a reflex that became all the more marked in a time of crisis.[4] The most prominent aspect of this trend was a mistrust of the other human sciences and their interpretative theories, which went beyond the strict collecting, authenticating and dating of artistic documents with a view to the production of catalogues.[5] To put it simply, one might say that the debate tended to be polarized between 'internalists', the heirs of an antiquarian tradition, and 'externalists', who instead laid claim to the tradition of cultural history, calling for an opening up of art history to other fields of knowledge.[6]

This distinction stems from links to different historical traditions. In order to acquire scientific legitimacy and gain autonomy from history, of which it was for a long time regarded as a simply auxiliary science (academic recognition has been very slow), art history was compelled to set itself apart from a certain 'essayistic' tradition, symbolized by figures such

---

[3] See Neil McWilliam and June Hargrove, eds., *Nationalism and French Visual Culture, 1870–1914* (London and New Haven, CT, 2004); Eric Michaud, *Histoire de l'art: Une discipline à ses frontières* (Paris, 2005).

[4] It is notable that Hans Belting's, *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte* (1983) had already been translated into French in 1989 as: *L'histoire de l'art est-elle finie?* trans. Jean-François Poirier and Yves Michaud (Nîmes, 1989). See, too, the article by Belting published under the rubric of 'Debate' in *Revue de l'art*, 'La fin d'une tradition?' *Revue de l'art* 69 (1985) 4–12.

[5] This criticism had already been made in 1974 by Henri Zerner in an epoch-making methodological stock-taking, 'L'art', *Faire de l'histoire, 2*, ed. Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora (Paris, 1974) 183–202. See also Zerner, *Écrire l'histoire de l'art: Figures d'une discipline* (Paris, 1997).

[6] See Daniel Lagoutte, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 1997) 151–5.

as Elie Faure or André Malraux, where the power of evocation was pre-
ferred to scholarly analysis.[7]

The work of Henri Focillon (1881–1943), who could be thought of as the
best expression of an art history 'à la française', preserved the traces of
what might conveniently be termed practical aesthetics, with an undeni-
able literary quality.[8] The earliest teaching of art history in France had
a similar orientation, as is evident from Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-
Duc (1863) and Hippolyte Taine (1864), who held Chairs at the École des
Beaux-Arts in Paris, or Charles Blanc who was Chair at the Collège de
France (1878), and who all drew a strong connection between aesthetics
and the history of art. The association of the two might be seen as formal-
ist, in the sense that form functions as the privileged mode of access to a
certain kind of transcendence, and that its evolution makes it possible to
follow the evolution of mind.

A separate art-historical current in France distanced itself from the aes-
thetic and literary model by drawing on a different tradition, namely, one
born out of the French Revolution and the establishment of museums
and institutions of patrimony,[9] to which it itself led.[10] With a character-
istically empirical approach to works and giving decisive importance to
documents, this art history, a tributary of the tradition of connoisseur-
ship, was intimately bound up with the institution of the museum, which
would leave an enduring mark on the way that art was taught and written
about in France. The École du Louvre is the best proof of this. Founded
in 1882 in order to train conservators and to educate the museum public,

---

[7] See Lyne Therrien, *L'histoire de l'art en France: Genèse d'une discipline universi-
taire* (Paris, 1998); Roland Recht, Philippe Sénéchal, Claire Barbillon, and François-René
Martin, eds., *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art en France au XIXᵉ siècle* (Paris, 2008); Germain
Bazin, *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art de Vasari à nos jours* (Paris, 1986) 466–96; Edouard
Pommier, ed., *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art, XVIIIᵉ et XIXᵉ siècles* (Paris, 1997); Claude Pétry,
L'histoire de l'art (Paris, 2005).

[8] See, for example, Christian Briend and Alice Thomine, eds., *La vie des formes: Henri
Focillon et les arts* (Ghent, 2004); Matthias Waschek, ed., *Relire Focillon* (Paris, 1998); Centre
Georges Pompidou, ed., *Pour un Temps: Henri Focillon* (Paris, 1986).

[9] The creation of the Historic Monuments Service in 1830 followed the establishment
of the École des Chartes in 1821, where the first true course in art history in France was set
up in 1846, which was dedicated to medieval archaeology. Today the Institute of National
Heritage (Institut national du patrimoine) is an establishment of higher education of the
Ministry of Culture and Communication, its mission being the training of state heritage
conservators as well as the training of heritage restorers.

[10] See Dominique Poulot, *Une histoire des musées de France, XVIIIᵉ–XXᵉ siècle* (Paris,
2005); Jean-Pierre Babelon and André Chastel, *La notion de patrimoine* (Paris, 1994); Roland
Recht, *Penser le patrimoine: Mise en scène et mise en ordre de l'art* (Paris, 2008).

this institution saw light well before the birth of the first university Chair in art history, which was awarded to Henri Lemonnier in 1899, and which created a gulf only increasing with time, between the museum world and that of the universities.

This double genealogy of the discipline explains the frictions at its core. Whereas one group of art historians criticized the others for their accumulative, dry scholarship (satisfied with establishing historical facts), the other reproached their peers for their reductive generalizations and their improper interpretations that were cut off from the material and historical reality of artworks.[11] This tension could only be accounted for by the divergence of their basic presuppositions; whereas the internalist art historian assumes a certain autonomy on the part of the artistic sphere, the externalist art historian denies art its autonomy and reduces it to its historic determinants (social, economic, political, religious and philosophical). The former accuses the latter of not taking into consideration the irreducibility of art to the social sphere; by reducing it to that which is not specific to the work, the latter is doing their best to say everything about what preceded and came after the work, but to say nothing about the work itself.[12] The latter, in turn, criticizes their counterpart and their 'history of art as a herbarium of dried specimens' both for holding onto a precarious and illusory identity and also for their hostility to all theory, thereby remaining blind, however, to the implicit theories that underpin their own knowledge.[13] The latter is in fact perpetuating a philosophy of history and an ideology of art that are all the more pernicious in that they are hidden beneath the appearance of objectivity.[14] 'What one can reproach this empiricism with is not its suspicion, but its naivety, whether real or pretended; it covertly supports an interpretation, a system of values, an ideology.'[15]

Recalling that empiricism is itself a theoretical position—which does not admit its theory—has not been enough in order to bridge this gulf

---

[11] See, for example, the virulent debates prompted by the exhibition on Jacques-Louis David held at the Louvre in 1989. Régis Michel, 'De la non-histoire de l'art', in *David contre David, 1*, ed. Régis Michel (Paris, 1993) XIII–LXII.

[12] This criticism has also been made by Yve-Alain Bois. See Bois, 'Vive le formalisme (bis)' *Art Press* 182 (1994) 47–51.

[13] See Hubert Damisch, 'Histoire et/ou théorie de l'art', *Scolies* 1 (1971) 27–36; Georges Didi-Huberman, *Devant l'image: Question posée aux fins d'une histoire de l'art* (Paris, 1990) 13–14 and 42–5.

[14] See Rainer Rochlitz, 'Stratégies de l'histoire de l'art', *Critique* 586 (1996) 133.

[15] Henri Zerner, 'L'art', in Le Goff and Nora, eds., *Faire de l'histoire*, 184. See, too, Hubert Damisch, 'Sociologie de l'art', in eds., *Encyclopædia Universalis* XXI (Paris, 1989) 228.

between theoretical and empirical approaches. Conversely, such a bridging will not be achieved merely by arguing that works of art served as illustrations for preconceived philosophies of art. It has been necessary, at a more fundamental level, to rethink the place of art history, which could be found neither in the documentation of the 'positivist' nor outside of history, in some form of transcendence that denies all kinds of evolution except that of forms. It is notable that this repositioning has taken the form of a return to the discipline's past. As Roland Recht, one of the main figures promoting this historiographic reorientation, has stated, 'a discipline that has lost its certainties inevitably questions its methods and, in addition, its own history. What is then at stake are the very contours of the discipline.'[16]

The first signs of such an historiographic and epistemological opening up can be seen in the *Revue de l'Art*, set up in 1968 thanks to the impetus of André Chastel (1912–1990), a pupil of Focillon. It played a crucial role in the recognition and development of art history in France. The *Revue* occupied a void in the landscape of French publishing that had only been filled by the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, established in 1859 by Edouard Houssaye, with Charles Blanc as its first editor-in-chief. For Chastel it involved not only ensuring the discipline's existence within the cultural domain and the French university, but also securing its international influence. This had to include reflections on the methods, theoretical problems and connections of art history to the human sciences. However this opening up was still regarded as insufficient by other art historians who sought to articulate as precisely as possible the theory of art and art history, and whose works today are central to the Centre for the History and Theory of Art ('Centre d'Histoire et Théorie des Arts') at the École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), set up by Hubert Damisch and Louis Marin.[17] One should equally mention, alongside this site of theoretical and historical reflection on art, the research and publishing programme of the National Higher School of Fine Arts ('École nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts', ENSBA) in Paris, a further key site in the teaching of the history of art since the nineteenth century, and which is today a real

---

[16] Roland Recht, 'Remarques liminaires', in Pommier, ed., *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art en France au XIXe siècle*, 7. See, also, Recht, *A quoi sert l'histoire de l'art?* (Paris, 2006); *L'objet de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 2003). See, too, the special issue of *Revue de l'Art* which he edited: *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art*, 146.4 (2004).

[17] See also, in this volume, Ralph Dekoninck, 'Theories of the Image in France: Between Art History and Visual Anthropology', 107–117.

laboratory, where art history goes hand in hand with the theory of art. As one would expect in a school of fine arts, this is naturally accompanied by an engagement with contemporary art.

However, the institution that best embodies the desire for dialogue and to join forces is the National Institute of Art History ('Institut National d'Histoire de l'Art', INHA). First proposed in 1973 by Jacques Thuiller, and then formalized by Chastel in 1983, with the aim of setting up a great institution on the same level and as influential as the Courtauld Institute in London or the Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte in Munich, this public scientific, cultural and professional institution was officially created on 12 July 2001, with the functions of training, research, documentation and the dissemination of scholarship. More fundamentally, it is at present contributing to building bridges between different sites and instances of scientific discourse on art in France, thanks, it should be noted, to the setting up of collective and federative programmes. Alongside the journal *Histoire de l'Art*, published by the Society of University Professors of Archaeology and Art History ('Association des professeurs d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art des universités', ApAhAu) since 1988, the idea of which is to publish the results of work by young researchers, the INHA journal *Perspective* is the clearest sign of an opening up to the other human sciences and to a foreign readership. With the aim of 'making research in France more dynamic by better locating it within larger international trends', it takes into account the renewed interest in questions of historiography.[18] One might also mention *Studiolo*, the art-historical journal of the French Académie in Rome, which publishes research on artistic exchanges between Italy and France, from the Renaissance to the twentieth century, within the wider European context. It is an open space for the most up to date debates in art history, dealing with its objects as well as its methods. Of the online journals, *Images re-vues* (www.imagesrevues .org) deserves particular attention. Created in 2005 by doctoral and postdoctoral researchers of the École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, it identifies itself as a space for reflection on the image, covering all periods and approaches.

The repositioning of art history in France was accomplished with a double movement. The first process, of 'despecification', based on a critical

---

[18] We note the announcement of the forthcoming *Dictionnaire des historiens de l'art français*, initiated and published by the INHA under the editorial direction of Claire Barbillon and Philippe Sénéchal. See the online version: http://www.inha.fr/spip. php?rubrique347 (accessed 16 September 2010).

revisiting of the discipline's past, consisted of overturning the artificial boundaries that separate the neighbouring human and social sciences; this was achieved by attending to the epistemologically hybrid nature of a discipline that originated and developed as a result of the interplay of various sets of issues and with the input from a diverse range of intellectual currents. This renewed general interrogation of the traditional chronological and theoretical framework is based, moreover, on what one may describe as comparative reasoning, since it was a matter of comparing works and texts from different times and places with a view to finding the shared issues that would be beyond the approach of a classical evolutionary scheme.[19]

In keeping with this double historiographic and comparative movement (chronological, geographical and disciplinary), French art history came to recognize its debt to other currents of thought and to encourage contact with them, which compelled it towards a permanent state of bricolage, made necessary by the protean nature of its objects of study.[20] Starting off from the richly paradoxical tenet that the specificity of an object, if not its systemic autonomy, is never more apparent than when its relation to other branches, other forms of social, material and signifying production, is considered with the greatest urgency, the art historian no longer has to choose between autonomy and the dissolution of the artwork, or between preserving the concrete richness of aesthetic phenomena and subordinating them to a project with an entirely different cognitive end (e.g. philosophical, sociological or psychological).[21] Art history thus presents itself as an open domain, 'although its openness would not signify that its objects are scattered or even dissipated. It would be uncertain with regard to its limits and its boundaries, it would be opportunistic in its basic principles, and its methods heteroclite. Its coherence, however, would not be based on some unitary system or methodology to which it has given rise, but rather on various operative heuristic decisions, of theoretical value and with practical force.'[22] In response to Marin's hope, expressed in 1993, one can observe a number of attempts at an opening

---

[19] See Marc Bayard, ed., *L'histoire de l'art et le comparatisme: Les horizons du détour* (Paris, 2007).

[20] Zerner, *Écrire l'histoire de l'art*, 13; Jean-Louis Schefer, *Questions de style* (Paris, 1995) 17–18.

[21] Damisch, 'Sociologie de l'art', 227.

[22] Louis Marin, 'L'œuvre d'art et les sciences sociales', in *Encyclopaedia Unversalis: Symposium: Les enjeux*, 2 (Paris, 1993) 948.

up—although not without controversy—to certain interpretative currents developed abroad, notably in the Anglo-Saxon countries, from the new art history, to visual studies or gender studies.[23] Much more pronounced is the marked influence of German *Bildwissenschaft*, which has benefitted from being a much more established tradition in France.[24] A noteworthy sign of this is the growth of interest in the work of Aby Warburg as well as a clear orientation towards the anthropology of art and the image. The impulse in this area has come, admittedly, from historians, most notably the Group for the Historical Anthropology of the Medieval West ('Groupe d'Anthropologie Historique de l'Occident Médiéval', GAHOM) led by Jean-Claude Schmitt, also editor of the series 'Le Temps des Images' published by Gallimard. This issue is not unconnected to the tensions between art historians and cultural anthropologists that appeared in relation to supposedly 'tribal art' ('arts premiers') and its place within the museological landscape with regard to the planned Musée du Quai Branly that eventually opened in 2006.[25]

These overtures to other approaches and other sets of issues, such as the expansion of the object of art history, even though still quite isolated,

---

[23] This has essentially been achieved by means of translations. One might cite the following examples: Linda Nochlin, *Femmes, art et pouvoir*, trans. Oristelle Bonis (Nîmes, 1993); Anne D'Alleva, *Méthodes & théories de l'histoire de l'art*, trans. Aude Cirier (Paris, 2006); William J.T. Mitchell, *Iconologie: Image, texte, idéologie*, trans. Maxime Boidy and Stéphanie Roth (Paris, 2009). See, too, Régis Michel, ed., *Où en est l'interprétation de l'œuvre d'art* (Paris, 2000). It is important to highlight the pioneering role of presses such as Jacqueline Chambon, Gérard Monfort, Gallimard and Macula in the translation of foreign art history texts. Thanks to them it is now possible to read in French authors such as Svetlana Alpers, Michael Baxandall, Hans Belting, Horst Bredekamp, Michael Camille, David Freedberg, Ernst Gombrich, Francis Haskell, Otto Pächt, Meyer Schapiro and others. They have largely contributed to overcoming its belated openness to foreign art history, thereby breaking with the sense of French art history as working cut off from the world.

[24] See the special issue ' "Iconic Turn" et réflexion sociétale', of the Franco-German journal of social and human sciences, *Trivium* 1 (2008), ed. Georges Didi-Huberman and Bernard Stiegler, which contained, most notably, articles by Horst Bredekamp and Gottfried Boehm (http://trivium.revues.org, accessed 15 September 2010).

[25] Discussion of this controversy would be a subject in itself. We merely highlight here the attempt to circumvent the controversy brought about by the organization of the colloquium *Histoire de l'art et anthropologie*, which was jointly organized by INHA and the Musée du Quai Branly in June 2002: Thierry Dufrêne and Anne-Christine Taylor, eds., *Cannibalismes disciplinaires: Quand l'histoire de l'art et l'anthropologie se rencontrent* (Paris, 2009), (on-line publication: http://actesbranly.revues.org/60, accessed 15 September 2010). See, too, the dossier 'Histoire de l'art et anthropologie', *Histoire de l'art* 60 (2007). The recent translations of works by Hans Belting, *Pour une anthropologie des images*, trans. Jean Torrent (Paris, 2004) and Alfred Gell, *L'art et ses agents: Une théorie anthropologique*, trans. Olivier Renaut and Sophie Renaut (Dijon, 2009) are other signs of the renewed interest in these disciplinary cross-overs.

would seem, despite everything, to answer the account delivered by Hans Belting at a conference organized in April 2000 at the Université de Tous les Savoirs (UTLS).[26] Reporting on the isolation of an art history seeking to consolidate its autonomy by maintaining the autonomy of its object, he criticized three kinds of exclusion: the exclusion of other media (photography,[27] cinema and computers); the exclusion of non-Western art, abandoning it to ethnography; and the exclusion of modern art. This last area merits sustained attention, for it presents a perfect example of the tensions affecting the discourse on art in France, which are all the more lively since they touch on a national heritage that has profoundly shaped the history of the art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and since the past being studied is recent, can therefore still be felt and is still living. For this reason we have chosen to accord it a significant place in this historiographic review.

   Let us start once more with an observation of a crisis: 'The War of Art' ('La Guerre de l'art').[28] It was with this particularly spectacular title that in 1997 the journal *Le Débat* claimed to offer an account of the famous 'dispute over contemporary art' ('querelle de l'art contemporain') that blew up in the 1990s, at just the same time as this journal was echoing the doubts that were running across the discipline of art history. This dispute had been a subject of much discussion during the 1990s. Where one might have expected a simple, more or less lively, debate on the criteria of contemporary art subsidized by the state, the dispute turned into a veritable 'war of memory'. An aesthetic debate became clouded with issues of history and politics. The debate on art invited itself in the midst of a general intellectual debate in a most raucous and confused fashion. Small wonder if it gave rise to considerable perplexity, not only amongst foreigners, such as Arthur Danto, but also in France itself, amongst representatives of the other human sciences. This grotesque moment left a deep impression, but one should not overlook the other, more credible attempts to devise a French contribution to the understanding of twentieth-century

---

[26] Hans Belting, 'L'histoire de l'art au tournant', in *L'art et la culture*, ed. Yves Michaud (Paris, 2002) 9–25. *Translator's note*: the UTLS is a university that promotes distance learning and the online dissemination of research, set up by the Ministry of Higher Education in 2000, led by Yves Michaud.

[27] On this subject see the symptomatic criticism by Jacques Thuillier, *Théorie générale de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 2003) 71–80.

[28] Jean Clair, 'La guerre de l'art: regards croisés sur Philippe Dagen et Yves Michaud', *Le Débat* 98 (1998) 4–12.

art. In order to be able to better locate the tension between research and polemic, it is necessary to step back several decades earlier.

For a historian of twentieth-century art, sometimes sceptical as to the contribution of French historiography when compared with that of American historiography, one acronym exemplified a generation of French pioneers who knew how to reinvent the history of twentieth-century art: CIEREC, the 'Centre Interdisciplinaire d'Etudes et de Recherches sur l'Expression Contemporaine' ('Interdisicplinary Centre for Study and Research into Contemporary Expression'), linked to the university of Saint-Etienne and organized within the museum of the same city. In fact it was in relation to this centre that several 'Colloquia on the History of Contemporary Art' were organized in the 1970s, which played a fundamental role in throwing light on more than one decisive issue.

An interview with Bernard Ceysson, one of the protagonists of this period, which was retrospectively felt, whether rightly or wrongly, to be 'heroic', enables us to identify several important questions.[29] In particular, he recounted how those in museums, engaged in a dynamic and critical vision of twentieth-century art and mindful of the need to mediate it to their publics, knew that they should become associated with university researchers such as Jean-Paul Bouillon or Françoise Levaillant. These colloquia thus threw up the question of the relation between universities and museums in a country where a central institution such as the MOMA still did not exist. Ceysson recalled in particular the first colloquium, dedicated to Cubism, where two schools, employing diverse methods and points of view could confront each other.[30] For Ceysson the 'soul of these colloquia' was Jean Laude, a 'great art historian with an exemplary curiosity' whose dissertation, recently published, was 'a sort of masterpiece, a model'.[31] After his death the team fell apart and everyone pursued their own personal fortunes or careers. In the eyes of these art historians this model had happily made up for a real lack in a France where university art history was ignorant, in a 'comical' fashion (the word is Ceysson's), of the important reflections of American and German authors.

---

[29] Bernard Ceysson, 'Entretien avec J.-P. Ameline et H. Bellet', in *Manifeste: Une histoire parallèle 1960–1990*, exhibition catalogue, Centre Georges Pompidou (Paris, 1993) 33–42.

[30] *Le Cubisme, actes du colloque*, Travaux de l'Université de Saint-Étienne, 4 (Saint-Étienne, 1973).

[31] Jean Laude, *La peinture française (1905–1914) et l'art nègre* (Paris, 1968). Republished in 2006.

Indeed it appears that Jean Laude was such a master that it would not be an exaggeration to say that his death in 1984 left a resurgent discipline in part orphaned. However, between the launch of the CIEREC colloquia and his death a significant new situation presented itself: the opening of the Musée national d'Art moderne in the Centre Georges Pompidou in 1977 and, soon after, the launch of its famous *Cahiers*, one of the most visible, organic sites of research on twentieth-century art in France.[32] There is indeed a 'before' and an 'after' 1977, since the 'sudden' and spectacular visibility of twentieth-century art within the landscape of French museums did not occur without generating a certain imbalance, to the point, as Catherine Millet has written, of dividing France in two. On the one hand, a 'gigantic collection held in a vice in a monstrous Centre' and, on the other hand, 'an infinity of other institutions, large and small, active or passive, isolated or much visited, but often considerably more limited in their means'.[33]

It is clear that our decision to emphasize the CIEREC colloquia leaves many other important initiatives in the 1970s or earlier unjustly in the shade, initiatives to which Ceysson himself paid homage. These colloquia are representative of a wider turbulence, but one which was relatively restricted. With the first large-scale retrospectives at the Musée National d'Art Moderne, museum professionals and researchers invited a much larger public to revisit the history of twentieth-century art, no longer viewing Paris nostalgically as a self-sufficient centre, but rather as resolutely tied to other large centres such as Moscow, Berlin or New York. These exhibitions, which were staged in collaboration with foreign experts, provided the occasion for a fundamental revision of the traditional French perception, often biased and incomplete, of the Russian, German or American avant-gardes.

The exhibition held in 1981 under the title *Les Réalismes 1919–1939. Entre Révolution et Réaction* merits particular attention, for as one of the most informed commentators noted, it made art history itself the 'principal

---

[32] Alongside the *Cahiers du Musée national d'art moderne* one should also mention, amongst those specifically dedicated to art of the twentieth century, the journal *Ligeia*, set up in 1988 by Giovanni Lista and still active today.

[33] Catherine Millet, 'Y a-t-il un art français?' (1994) in Millet, *Le critique d'art s'expose* (Nîmes, 1995) 248. This assertion should be qualified by taking note of the fundamental contribution, in Paris itself, of the Musée d'art moderne de la Ville (open since 1961) and in particular of the role of Suzanne Pagé.

object of reflection'.[34] For Jean Clair, the organizer, the exhibition involved taking into consideration a substantial portion of the international artistic production between the Wars that had escaped the history of the avant-gardes. It was due to this exhibition that the French public discovered the American 'realism' of a figure such as Edward Hopper. Such artistic production had often been hidden, but it could no longer be ignored by the 'supposed impartiality of the historian'.[35] The main methodological reference point that Clair invoked was, to be specific, a substantial intervention by Jean Laude in a CIEREC colloquium on the idea of a 'Return to Order'.[36] Laude had argued that to narrate the history of art by only paying attention to 'innovations', and by passing in silence over the context from which these innovations were breaking loose, involved committing a serious 'reconstruction' of that history. A similar debate would take place shortly afterwards with the opening of the Musée d'Orsay in 1986, which addressed the chance to show anew the academic 'pompiers' alongside the Impressionists. However *Les Réalismes 1919–1939* dealt with several artists such as Derain, Picasso, Carrà, de Chirico and Dix, who had returned to a more 'classical' production after they had contributed to the avant-garde. How might one account for works which had long been equated with pure and simple 'regressions'?

In his review the university-based critic Jean-Paul Bouillon did not hesitate to speak of the 'eddies stirred up by the exhibition'.[37] No doubt he was echoing the reaction of Catherine Millet, editor of the journal *Art Press*. Created in 1972, this journal, which was tightly bound up with 'Parisian' intellectual history, quickly established its place as an indispensable organ of the criticism of contemporary art and still is today. It would not be an exaggeration to state that the highly negative review of *Les Réalismes* in

---

[34] Jean-Paul Bouillon, 'Review of *Les Réalismes 1919–1939*, Exhibition at the Centre national d'art et de culture Georges-Pompidou', in *Universalia 1982. Les événements, les hommes, les problèmes en 1981* (Paris, 1982) 504–7.

[35] Jean Clair, 'Données d'un problème', in *Les Réalismes 1919–1939. Entre révolution et réaction* (Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris, 17 décembre 1980–20 avril 1981), ed. Jean Clair (Paris, 1981) 8–14.

[36] Jean Laude, 'Retour et/ou Rappel à l'ordre?' in *Le Retour à l'ordre dans les arts plastiques et l'architecture 1919–1925*: Actes du second colloque d'Histoire de l'art contemporain, Université de Saint-Etienne, 15–16–17 février 1974 (Saint-Etienne, 1975) 7–44.

[37] In fact one of the most virulent criticisms would come from across the Atlantic, in an article by Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, 'Figures of Authority, Ciphers of Regression: Notes on the Return of Representation in European Painting', *October* 16 (1981) 39–68, which was quickly translated into French and included in the anthology *Formalisme et historicité: Autoritarisme et régression: Deux essais sur la production artistique dans l'Europe contemporaine* (Paris, 1982). Twenty years later in 2000 a comparable exhibition was staged at the MOMA in New York by Robert Storr: *Modern Art despite Modernism* (New York, 2002).

Art Press created a stand-off between two major institutions of the new artistic landscape that had emerged in the 1970s. In this exemplary debate the three leading figures in the field of art reflected what were, in principle, three distinct types of publication and discursive production: the museum, the press and the university. And they reflected three institutional actors: the exhibition organizer, the art critic, and the university researcher.

One might wonder, however, why a journal focusing on contemporary art so took to heart the task of warning against an exhibition dedicated to the history of inter-war art. In a conference on the history of her journal, Millet was later forced to declare 'we had to assume that we were a journal of contemporary art that never stopped... multiplying the numbers of historical rubrics'.[38] But she did not hide her concern with regard to the risk that what she judged to be a 'reconstruction' and a 'manipulation' could have implications for the art of the present. Thus she concluded her article with a concern rooted in a vision of the present: 'let us be suspicious of the *returns to order* that are being prepared for us.'[39] Wrapped up in this phrase was a conviction based on speculation about supposed motives, a suspicion that the 'historical' re-evaluation defended by Jean Clair was in fact the rehabilitation, pure and simple, of artists being proposed as models for the art of the present. The author in question would later go on to confirm this suspicion in a work entitled, significantly, *Critique de la modernité*: the return to classicism of de Chirico, Carrà and Picasso is legitimized in terms of offering a *new genealogy* of contemporary art. Within the differing positions being presented the debate slipped across from the terrain of art into that of politics, mobilizing the memory of the totalitarianisms of the twentieth century. In France, more than elsewhere, the figures of the historian and the critic seemed decidedly intermixed, and the wounds of history seemed to weigh heavily on the debates.

In 1984 Pierre Daix, a major expert on Picasso, whose friend he had been, put forward the idea of a vast critical reassessment of the questions raised by the *Les Réalismes* exhibition, by putting them back into the general history of twentieth century art. His book, entitled *L'Ordre*

---

[38] Catherine Millet, 'L'histoire continue', (1992) in Millet, *Le critique d'art s'expose*, 24. In 1987 Millet also addressed the general historical retrospective *L'art contemporain en France*. The second edition of 1994 covered the period 1965–1994.

[39] Catherine Millet, 'Un trouble de mémoire sur le plateau de Beaubourg' (1980), in Millet, *Le critique d'art s'expose*, 146.

et l'Aventure, was also dedicated to the memory of the recently deceased Jean Laude.[40] This reference point is cited by such different personalities, so little in agreement with each other, that it would be difficult to link it to any 'school' or tradition constituting the spine of the French historiography of twentieth-century art. Paradoxically, this evocation of the 'great forefather' underlined instead the turmoil and the internal divisions of the field it demarcated. Since that point Daix has put forward the idea of rewriting the history of twentieth-century art under the sign of a 'cultural history' constantly marked by its political implications.

In these debates reference to the 'return to order' in France around 1920 was always present; it is this that should be the point of comparison of the recent criticisms of 'contemporary art'. The reception of Kenneth Silver's book *Esprit de Corps*, published in France in 1991 with the title *Vers le retour à l'ordre* ('Towards the Return to Order') reinforced this vision, in which there seemed to be close connection between chauvinism, a crisis in the avant-garde and a scandalous 'clearance sale' by the state of Cubist works. Unfortunately this work has not been set in a wider context, that of the *New Art History*.[41] The response to the contributions of American historiography had too often been deficient and fuelled a simplistic vision, as if xenophobia was an integral part of the French scene at that time.[42] Anglo-Saxon historiography thus contributed unintentionally to dramatizing issues of history in France. If the year 1920 had various undertones, then the year 1940 and the Vichy régime constituted an undeniable trauma, the memory of which still left people haunted and fed an understandable feeling of guilt. This explains the importance of the scholarly elaboration by Laurence Bertrand-Dorléac of the institutional and ideological context of art during the Occupation.[43]

On the one hand the debate at the beginning of the 1980s around the *Les Réalismes* exhibition was the 'cultural symptom' of a past era: that of the so-called 'postmodern' architecture of a figure such as Ricardo Boffill and movements such as the Italian transavantgarde and its return to painting.

---

[40] Pierre Daix, *L'Ordre et l'Aventure. Peinture, modernité et répression totalitaire* (Paris, 1984).

[41] See the critical comments by David Cottington, *Cubism and its Histories* (Manchester and New York, 2004) 227.

[42] See the nuances and the *mea culpa* of Christopher Green, whose book *Cubism and its Enemies: Modern Movements and Reaction in French Art 1916–1928* (London and New Haven, CT, 1987) had strongly influenced Silver: Green, 'Les cubismes de l'École de Paris', in *L'École de Paris, 1904–1929, la part de l'autre*, exhibition catalogue Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris (Paris, 2001) 65.

[43] See Laurence Bertrand Dorléac, *L'art de la défaite 1940–1944* (Paris, 1993).

Yet, the putative 'art war' of 1997 in France dragged up themes similar to those from 1981 and the same protagonists were marshalled, even though the international art world had profoundly changed in the meantime.[44] Once more, it involved, for some, a linking of contemporary art criticism to the revision of all writing on the history of twentieth-century art, while for others it involved raising the alarm over such 'revisionism', which in their eyes was associated with a wider neo-conservative vision of society and culture.

Between 1981 and 1997 what was new was the virulence of the debate and the fact that it went beyond a restricted circle in becoming *the* intellectual controversy of the moment. In 1997, as in 1981, one could not but be struck by the way that debates about the art of the present time became entangled within those relating to earlier moments in the twentieth century and, its corollary, the difficulty of sensing the boundary between the art history professor in the university and the committed art critic. This fact was illustrated well by the role in the debate played by Philippe Dagen, who was both a university professor of art history and an influential art critic of the newspaper *Le Monde*. Yet while these controversies seemed to reflect a specifically French context, they crystallized the more universal question of evaluation and the selection of works to be exhibited and talked about.

Between 1981 and 1997 public support for contemporary artistic creation grew unabated at a national level as much as at the level of regional authorities that had been reformed by the process of decentralization (cf. The Regional Funds for Contemporary Art, FRAC). Within such a context of state patronage one can understand why an issue as difficult as that of *criteria of evaluation* became a public, political question. In this context it is easier to understand why the function of the independent art critic might appear decisive. Yet in France, as elsewhere, the 'internal' or 'formal' criteria for evaluating artwork as an autonomous, specific object are in a state of crisis. This is doubtless what the political aggravation of the debate of 1997 involuntarily made evident for observers; an absence of consensus about the criteria of evaluation but also about the very definition of 'contemporary art'.

---

[44] For an appraisal of this see the dossier in *Débat* mentioned earlier with its various views of the respective books of Jean Clair, Philippe Dagen and Yves Michaud. See, too, Rainer Rochlitz, 'La querelle de l'art contemporain', *Critique* 64 (1998) 99–120 and Marc Jimenez, *La querelle de l'art contemporain* (Paris, 2005) 340–58.

One should stress here the significance of the time-lag with the Anglo-Saxon world where discussion had been centred since the 1960s on the 'modernist' theory embodied by Clement Greenberg. While Greenberg was well known amongst French specialists in American painting, it was only around 1986 that translations and debates made it easier to place him at the *heart* of reflections on the art of the twentieth century and, then, to understand the positions, such as that of Rosalind Krauss, that were defined in opposition to him.[45] Authors such as Thierry de Duve and Yve-Alain Bois, who in other respects were very different, appear to have been the exception in their precocious and acute knowledge of the American debate.

But the scales tipped the other way, too. The justified importance given to American art after 1945 sometimes ended up by eclipsing European art of the same era. It was with the goal of achieving a rebalancing, without polemic, that the inaugural exhibition of the new Museum of Modern Art in Saint-Étienne opened in 1987 was *L'Art en Europe, les années décisives, 1945–1953*.[46] The belated recognition of the importance of Greenberg sometimes led to a diminishing of the European and French sources of 'modernism'. This raised the whole issue of the history of art criticism in the universities. As for the presence or lack of international recognition of French art since 1960, it gave rise to a more demanding tone, as became evident in the preface to the first anthology to be published on the period 1960–85 in France. Robert Millard, the editor, was astonished that a 'comfortable and simplistic' vision of things had been imposed by the major international public events: 'It was as if the crisis at the beginning of the 1960s, which had sanctioned the isolation of Paris on the international stage, had definitively relegated our country to the status of a subaltern province, with no more room to recount its history, since history was

---

[45] It is important to recognize the translation work of the publishing house Macula. As early as 1979 it published a valuable anthology edited by Claude Gintz that included translations of texts by authors such as Clement Greenberg and Rosalind Krauss, *Regards américains sur l'art des années soixante* (Paris, 1979). However, it took many years before the questions raised would be absorbed and deployed in the wider debates within the French art world.

[46] Jacques Beauffet, ed., *L'Art en Europe, les années décisives, 1945–1953* (Geneva, 1987). In their foreword to the exhibition catalogue Bernard Ceysson and Jacques Beauffet wrote: 'This exhibition and this book would like to "make visible once more" a somewhat forgotten episode of twentieth-century art. After the golden legend of the School of Paris there followed the story of the heroic myth of the New York School. Hagiographic stories have effaced history far too much.'

taking place elsewhere.[47] That same year, 1986, one of the main French art critics, Bernard Lamarche-Vadel, who was one of the best informed about the international art scene, raised the issue with the question: 'what is French art?' His intention was to get beyond the feeling of 'isolation', for which he held French taste to be partly responsible. This art critic, who died in 2000, now seems to have been one of the major artistic transmitters during the 1970s and 1980s. It was only right and proper that a major museum, the Musée d'art moderne de la Ville de Paris, should devote an exhibition to him with, notably, work on him by art historians.[48]

Criteria governing the past, criteria governing the present; was there continuity, a permanent process of re-evaluation, or a major caesura? Within the context of the crises of the 'internalist' criteria inherited from 'modernist' formalism, the external legitimation provided by history gave a strengthened sense of importance. The traditional vision consisted of securing the place of assertions about the present in a continuous chain connected to the victories of yesterday. This is still the position of Serge Lemoine, a significant figure in the academic and the museum worlds, who edited *Histoire de l'art moderne et contemporain* with an impressive team of researchers from a number of universities and museums.[49] The major movements (the -isms, such as Cubism) were 'facts', and it would be wrong to relativize them or put them into context. This vision of continuity, which cast into doubt any idea of rupture between modern art and the art before, or between modern and contemporary art, led back to the old 'modernist' conviction of a mainstream about which there could be a consensus.

It was precisely this kind of genealogy that a number of historians of twentieth-century art tried to challenge, for it basically refused to acknowledge the numerous re-evaluations of movements and artists which demonstrated the relative and provisional nature of any historical construction. As Jean-Paul Bouillon stated in the foreword to his vast survey of the art of the first half of the century, published in 1996, the task

---

[47] Robert Maillard, 'Avant-propos', in *Vingt-cinq ans d'art en France: 1960–1985*, ed. Bernard Ceysson (Paris, 1986) 5.

[48] Isabelle Rabineau, *Dans l'œil du critique. Bernard Lamarche-Vadel et les artistes* (Paris, 2009).

[49] Serge Lemoine, ed., *Histoire de l'art moderne et contemporain* (Paris, 2006). See the critical comments by Jean-Marc Poinsot, 'Discours actuels sur l'histoire de l'art du XXe siècle. Écrire en mots ou en objets', *Perspective* 3 (2007) 490–501.

of the art historian cannot be separated from an 'unremitting revision of his own narrative'.[50]

Many of these difficulties disappear by reckoning with the fact that it is at least possible to stress *one* major landmark, which was the rise of 'contemporary art', defined as an artistic *genre*, at an easily identifiable moment in history, the 1960s. If we agree to identify this moment as a major split, a paradigm shift, then the interactions of art history and art criticism undergo a profound modification. Reflection on the art of the present can then be completely freed from the insoluble debates on writing about art before 1960.

It was the advent of a new and different category that was narrated and celebrated in a work published in the Mazenod reference series in 2005 and edited by Daniel Soutif, yet another author who was an art critic in the national press (for the paper *Libération*).[51] With this discontinuous vision, which denies any relevance to the very concept of 'twentieth-century art', a number of quarrels no longer seem to have any real object, and the roles of the historian of 'modern art' and of the historian-critic of 'contemporary art' are clearly distinguished and better defined. The world of what are, from now on, termed the 'historic' avant-gardes seems very distant, as do the contemporaneous tormented political contexts. From now on certain controversies appear to have no object. Recourse to such a radical periodization clarifies the branches of knowledge and pacifies the approach to the issues involved. However, it is not certain that such major chronological breaks, the effects of which are as powerful as those of the earlier breaks between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, would satisfy the heir of Jean Laude, who justly criticized the arbitrary nature of such an absolute cleavage.

Conclusion

The landscape of the study of twentieth-century art over the last thirty years provides a case study that casts light on the wider French situation. It is possible to see how the relations, sometimes distant, sometimes close to

---

[50] Jean-Paul Bouillon, 'Avant-propos', in Jean-Paul Bouillon, Paul-Louis Rinury, and Antoine Baudin, *L'art du XXᵉ siècle, 1900–1939* (Paris, 1996) 7–9.

[51] Daniel Soutif, 'Introduction. Du moderne au contemporain', in *L'art du XXᵉ siècle, 1939–2002* (Paris, 2005) 9–13. See too the comments by Jean-Marc Poinsot on this book in Poinsot, 'Discours actuels sur l'histoire'. A selection of Soutif's writings is collected in *Papiers Journal: Chroniques d'art (1981–1993)* (Nîmes, 1993).

the point of entanglement, between scientific research (within the frame-
work of the universities), aesthetic, even political engagement (in art criti-
cism in the press) and communication with the wider public (through the
concerns of the museums) are played out. The sense of a certain 'belated-
ness' in relation to art history internationally, which was attested to by the
investigation of *Débat* in 1991, was felt here at a very early stage, indeed all
the more so given that the French art scene, acknowledged as central dur-
ing the time of the 'École de Paris', was undergoing a crisis of legitimacy
from 1960 onwards. We have tried to demonstrate how, in the debates
over twentieth-century art, a certain disciplinary 'malaise' sometimes also
interacted with a 'national guilty conscience'. Even if this state of disquiet
could encourage reductive polemics (the 'dispute over contemporary art'),
it could also provide a powerful stimulus. The impressive effort given to
translation and re-publication cannot be separated from the desire to
examine once more the foundations of the discipline. The most important
issue is no longer that of remedying some putative belatedness—in rela-
tion to whom, or to what?—but to maintain a clear, self-reflective stance,
in which one emerges as a perpetual work-in-progress.

ART HISTORY IN GERMAN-SPEAKING COUNTRIES: AUSTRIA, GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND

Charlotte Schoell-Glass

A long time ago it was suggested (half jokingly) that 'the mother tongue of art history is German', doubtless repeated with a sigh by those whose mother tongue was not German. Today, we all more or less willingly live with the fact that the *lingua franca* of art history is English. As is to be expected when a global idiom dominates, local languages continue to flourish, as do local cultures, if sometimes completely under the radar of the globalized perspective. This is the case with art history in German-speaking countries, Austria and Germany, as well as the German-speaking part of Switzerland, forming, to a degree, a common publishing and job market. Most importantly, however, they share a common early history: Jacob Burckhardt was born in Switzerland but studied and trained in Berlin before returning to his native Basel. Alois Riegl spent his whole life in Vienna but was widely read in Germany and Switzerland. Heinrich Wölfflin, also Swiss, spent the greater part of his brilliant career in Germany, where he taught in Berlin, as well as Munich, before returning to Switzerland in 1924. Since then, of course, almost everything has changed. But the fact remains that the university systems and cultural institutions are much alike in them all. Since the early nineteenth century, universities were founded in all three countries on the basis of a common conviction: that cultural education ('Bildung') should in principle be accessible to and free for all, and that teaching and research should be accomplished freely, without any pressure from the state or economic constraints. In the last two decades this ideal has been eroded somewhat.[1] But even today, historical and philosophical disciplines, including art history, in earlier times

---

[1] The concept of 'Bildung' is not fully translatable as it carries with it connotations of its late eighteenth-century Enlightenment and subjectivist beginnings (as in *Bildungsroman*), as well as its embeddedness in concepts of the history of the German bourgeois class. 'Bildung' not only refers to intellectual education but also to a degree to character formation as in 'Herzensbildung' (lit. 'heart education'). The humanities in Germany have been political in the sense that 'Bildung', for a long time, had to stand in for political empowerment. There is a substantial body of scholarship on the concept of 'Bildung'; see for instance: Aleida Assmann, *Arbeit am nationalen Gedächtnis: Eine kurze Geschichte der deutschen Bildungsidee* (Frankfurt am Main, 1993).

fundamental to the education of young men and, after the First World War, young women as well, are still regarded as important, albeit almost purpose-free, branches of knowledge, and are therefore still supported by society, and thus also by state and university administrations.

Institutional History

The history of art has been studied in Germany for well over 200 years. Depending on whether one focuses on art-historical scholarship itself or the institutions of researching and teaching art history, one may wish to begin the history of art history with Johann Joachim Winckelmann's *History of the Art of Antiquity* (*Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*, published in Dresden in 1764), or even his *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture* (*Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst*) already published in 1754–55.[2] In these seminal texts, Winckelmann developed the categories for writing the history of art of antiquity that continued to be influential for the writing of the history of later art throughout the nineteenth century, when art history as a discipline was shaped.

   If one looks at the institutional structures of the formation of the discipline, its history begins in 1799 in Göttingen, where the first professor for the history of art, Johann Dominik Fiorillo, curator of the art collection of the University of Göttingen, taught art history as well as drawing. There were a number of chairs of art history that predated the founding of institutes and 'Seminare' at many German, Austrian and Swiss universities during the nineteenth century. Jacob Burckhardt was professor for art history at the Eidgenössische Hochschule in Zurich between 1854 and 1858, and he held his chair in Basel from 1858 until 1893 both as historian and art historian. Neither of these universities had an Institute of Art History at that time. Those were founded in Bonn, Leipzig and Strasbourg in 1873, in Berlin in 1875, and in Tübingen in 1894. In Vienna, the first chair had already been founded in 1852. By 1891, Franz Wickhoff and by 1897, Alois Riegl held the two chairs that from then on traditionally made up the Viennese institute.

---

[2] Johann J. Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave (Los Angeles, 2006); Winckelmann, *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture*, trans. Elfriede Heyer and Roger C. Norton (La Salle, IL, 1987).

In 1912 Wilhelm Waetzold presented a survey of the state of the institutionalization of art history in universities and similar institutions such as art academies.[3] By then, 132 persons taught art history in Germany in various institutions of higher learning, including Königsberg (Kaliningrad), where art history had been taught since 1825, and Strasbourg. Of these, twenty-seven were full professors ('Ordinarien') and fifteen were associate professors ('Extraordinarien'). By the early twentieth century, art history in German-speaking countries was a young but well-established discipline, taught at over twenty universities.

Art history, although it had been founded in the context of the tortuous formation of a German national identity, was never only (or even predominantly) concerned with German art. Italian art was, and remained for decades, central to the discipline. In 1897 the Kunsthistorisches Institut was founded in Florence,[4] and in 1913 the Bibliotheca Hertziana followed in Rome as one of the institutes of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft. After the First World War, two important new universities were founded in Frankfurt and Hamburg. They were to reflect the values of the Weimar Republic, and Hamburg, at least—with Erwin Panofsky as its first professor of art history—housed a soon to be well-known 'Seminar' (seminary or institute) that drew many gifted students. In Hamburg, the history of art was taught and studied in new ways, with an emphasis on including written sources and the cultural context of art in any given epoch.

By that time, a number of important journals had been established, providing a platform for publishing research and debate, among them the *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, the *Kritische Berichte*, as well as several yearbooks in Berlin, Vienna, and Marburg (1924). The *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*,[5] founded in 1932 by Ernst Gall and Wilhelm Waetzold, was suspended from 1943 until 1949, but continued thereafter, and remains an internationally recognized journal, still published predominantly in German.[6]

---

[3] The proceedings were published only after the First World War. Wilhelm Waetzold's account during the 'Seduta plenaria', *Atti del X Congresso internazionale di storia dell'arte, Roma 1912* (Rome, 1922) 17–42; (on Germany, 24–32). There are also highly interesting reports on the state of art history in other countries just before the war.

[4] Hans W. Hubert, ed., *Das Kunsthistorische Institut in Florenz: Von der Gründung bis zum hundertjährigen Jubiläum 1897–1997* (Florence, 1997).

[5] Replacing the *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* and the *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*.

[6] Charlotte Schoell-Glass, 'Zeitschriften', in *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft: Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe*, ed. Ulrich Pfisterer (Stuttgart and Weimar, 2003) 395–400.

   The single most important fact determining the discipline of art history
in the twentieth century in German-speaking countries was, however, the
rise to power of the National Socialists in 1933. Hundreds of art histori-
ans, students, curators, art dealers, and professors had to flee Germany,
leaving behind an emasculated discipline.[7] Art history in Austria and Ger-
many lost its most creative potential, and, for a number of reasons, did
not recover from that loss for many decades, both during the Nazi era
and afterwards. Art history naturally continued as a profession after 1933
in museums and universities, as well as in the field of monument pro-
tection ('Denkmalpflege'). As is now well known and generally acknowl-
edged, continuity was the order of the day in the difficult post-war period.
Until the 1960s, therefore, there was a curious sense of business as usual,
underpinned, of course, by enormous efforts physically and institutionally
to rebuild the damaged structures of universities and institutes among the
ruins of many German cities.

   After the war, the Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte in Munich (1946)
and the Freie Universität in Berlin, with a new institute for art history
(1948), were founded; new journals, the *Kunstchronik. Monatsschrift für
Kunstwissenschaft, Museumswesen und Denkmalpflege* (1948) and later
the new *Kritische Berichte* (1975) followed. The field, however, was divided,
as was all of Germany. There is little that has been written about this
division or, for that matter, a history of art history in the German Demo-
cratic Republic (GDR or DDR) beyond very few articles by some of the
East German historians who lost their jobs after 1990.[8] While there is as
yet no overall picture of the situation of art history in the GDR, it may be
said that the teaching of the subject was reduced almost to insignificance,
apart, perhaps from Berlin. It was probably more tightly supervised as
to ideological correctness than during the 1930s and 1940s, and it greatly
suffered from its international isolation after the 'Wall' went up in 1961,
cutting all through Germany from north to south. Museums on the

---

   [7] Ulrike Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil*,
2 vols. (Munich, 1999); Karen Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft: Deutschsprachige
Kunstgeschichte im amerikanischen Exil* (Berlin, 1999).
   [8] See *kritische berichte* 19 (1991). In this volume there are a number of articles on vari-
ous aspects of art history in the former GDR; among the authors are Hubertus Adam,
Friedrich Möbius, Maria Rüger, Hartmut Pätzke and Harald Olbrich. See, too, Peter H.
Feist, 'Schwierige Nachbarschaft: Die Kunstgeschichtswissenschaft in der DDR in ihrem
Verhältnis zur Kunstgeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft in den benachbarten ostmitteleu-
ropäischen Ländern' in *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der nationale
Diskurs* (*Humboldt-Schriften zur Kunst- und Bildgeschichte* 1), ed. Robert Born and Alena
Janatková (Berlin, 2004) 421–34.

other hand, particularly the great museums in Berlin and Dresden, continued to function, if under grave economic constraints as well as political pressures.

In the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries, the only large professional association for art historians in Europe was the CIHA (Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art). Only after the Second World War did national associations follow: the Association of German Art Historians ('Verband deutscher Kunsthistoriker', founded in 1948, with approximately 2,300 members in 2010), the Ulm Association ('Ulmer Verein', established in 1968), the Austrian Association of Art Historians ('Österreichischer Kunsthistorikerverband', now the 'Verband österreichischer Kunsthistorikerinnen und Kunsthistoriker', formed in 1983) and the Swiss Society, the 'Vereinigung der Kunsthistorikerinnen und Kunsthistoriker in der Schweiz' (VKKS, founded in 1976, with some 850 members in 2010).

Intellectual History

The intellectual history of art history in the German-speaking countries was written early on and, for a long time to come, as a history of masters, on the model of Vasari's *Vite*, one might say. Those master art historians were engaged in a competition as to which methodology should prevail, even as those methodologies were being developed in the course of these debates. As early as 1921 and 1924, Wilhelm Waetzold published a collection of portraits, running to two volumes, of *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker*, and Johannes Jahn edited *Die Kunstwissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen* ('Contemporary Art History and Theory through Self-Portraits') also in 1924.[9] Udo Kultermann's *History of Art History* (*Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte. Der Weg einer Wissenschaft*), first published in 1966, was likewise organized in part around eminent art historians and their contributions to the field.[10] This too was the case with Michael Podro's *The Critical Historians of Art*, organized around the achievements of Austrian and German art historians since the nineteenth century.[11] Collections of portraits of eminent art historians were published again in 1990,

---

[9] Wilhelm Waetzold, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1921 and 1924); Johannes Jahn, ed., *Die Kunstwissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1924).

[10] Udo Kultermann, *Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte: Der Weg einer Wissenschaft* (Munich, 1990; first published Vienna and Dusseldorf, 1966); subsequently published in English as *History of Art History* (New York, 1993).

[11] Michael Podro, *The Critical Historians of Art* (Newhaven, CT, 1982; 2nd edn. 1983).

Altmeister moderner Kunstgeschichte, edited by Heinrich Dilly, and by Ulrich Pfisterer, *Klassiker der Kunstgeschichte* in 2007 and 2008.[12] Research and publications on the art historians who had to leave Germany after 1933 were also focused on individuals, their fates, and their contributions.[13] While Ulrike Wendland's *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil* is not only, or even predominantly, concerned with eminent art historians, but was to be a tribute to all those who had been forced to leave Germany under threat to their lives, the other collections as a tradition contribute to an ongoing master discourse regarding the history of art history in German-speaking countries. Probably this emphasis on 'masters' and the fact that not a single female art historian attained the necessary status for inclusion in these collections feed into each other.

But there have been other ways of writing the history of art history in Germany: one controversial approach was a volume compiled from papers given at the biennial art historians' conference ('Kunsthistorikertag') in Cologne in 1970, *Das Kunstwerk zwischen Wissenschaft und Weltanschauung* (The Artwork between Scholarly Study and *Weltanschauung*), published in 1970.[14] It looked at the uses art-historical scholarship had been put to in the 1930s and earlier, and, most provocatively at the time, at the continuities in German art history before, during, and after the Nazi regime. One of the papers for instance, the analysis by Martin Warnke of the language of domination and coercion in the description of works of— particularly German—art in popular art literature, authored by highly regarded art historians, brought about a storm of indignation from the established representatives of the field. These controversies, then seen in terms of politically left and right persuasions, have since been eroded. In fact, those attempts critically to assess the recent history of the discipline were the first, if not particularly thorough, looking at the history of art history in terms of ideas and ideologies. But only recently has the Nazi past of German art history been studied more systematically by a group of scholars brought together by the late Jutta Held.[15] Generally, what had or had

---

[12] Heinrich Dilly, ed., *Altmeister moderner Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin, 1990); Ulrich Pfisterer, ed., *Klassiker der Kunstgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Munich, 2007 and 2008).

[13] Ulrike Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch*; Karen Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft*.

[14] Martin Warnke, ed., *Das Kunstwerk zwischen Wissenschaft und Weltanschauung* (Gütersloh, 1970). See in particular Warnke's contribution 'Weltanschauliche Motive in der kunstgeschichtlichen Populärliteratur' (88–108).

[15] Nikola Doll and Christian Fuhrmeister, eds., *Kunstgeschichte im Nationalsozialismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte einer Wissenschaft zwischen 1930 und 1950* (Weimar, 2005); Ruth

not happened during the Third Reich fell under the spell of a collective suppression bordering on amnesia for decades. It was not until the early 1970s that the first attempts were made to look more closely at the history of art and art history of the Nazi era. Moreover, even today, although there are a fair number of publications now on the topic, no systematic history of Nazi art history has yet been written.[16]

One of the first attempts to open this can of worms was published by the indefatigable historiographer of German art history, Heinrich Dilly, whose slim volume *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker 1933–1945* was published in 1988.[17] The title again suggests an almost automatic focus on masters, even when they are not shining examples; however, the text opens up perspectives on methodologies (predominantly the geography of art), on institutional changes (in particular quantitative developments), or changes of policies in museums. There, new ways of displaying the collections were sought to lower the threshold for all potential visitors, after, of course, museums had been purged of any artworks that were deemed degenerate ('entartet').[18] Elsewhere, it could be shown that unexpectedly, at least in Berlin, teaching of the history of art was not wholly concentrated on German art.[19]

Between 1940 and 1945, a war effort by all the humanities, among them art history, was organized: the 'Aktion Ritterbusch' of the 'Deutsche Geisteswissenschaft'.[20] Art history was a latecomer to the project which

Heftrig, Olaf Peters, and Barbara Schellewald, eds., *Kunstgeschichte im 'Dritten Reich': Theorien, Methoden, Praktiken* (Berlin, 2008).

[16] Marlite Halbertsma, *Wilhelm Pinder und die deutsche Kunstgeschichte* (Worms, 1985; first published in Dutch 1985); Frank-Rutger Hausmann, *'Deutsche Geisteswissenschaft' im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Die 'Aktion Ritterbusch' (1940–1945): Schriften zur Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 1 (Dresden and Munich, 1998); Jutta Held, Dirk Janssen, Bettina Kohlstedt, Martin Papenbrock, Sophie Reinhardt, Hilde Schreiner, and Rosemarie Sprute, eds., *Kunstgeschichte an den Universitäten im Nationalsozialismus: Kunst und Politik, Jahrbuch der Guernica-Gesellschaft* 5 (Göttingen 2003) (2003); See, too, Michael Viktor Schwarz, ed., *Wiener Schule: Erinnerung und Perspektiven*: *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 53 (Vienna, Cologne and Weimar, 2004).

[17] Heinrich Dilly, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker 1933–1945* (Munich and Berlin, 1988).

[18] Dilly, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker*, 58–62. There is a plethora of publications, easy to access, on the activities around the purging of Germany of all modernist art, the theft of art from Jewish collectors and the recent restitution efforts and debates. Among the many publications, and written before the topic became fashionable: Christoph Zuschlag, *'Entartete Kunst': Ausstellungsstrategien im Nazi-Deutschland* (Worms, 1995).

[19] Sabine Arend, '"Einen neuen Geist einführen…?" Das Fach Kunstgeschichte unter den Ordinarien Albert Erich Brinckmann (1931–1935) und Wilhelm Pinder (1935–1945)', in *Die Berliner Universität in der NS-Zeit*, 2: *Fachbereiche und Fakultäten*, ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch and Rebecca Schaarschmidt (Wiesbaden, 2005) 179–97.

[20] Hausmann, 'Die Kunstgeschichte', *'Deutsche Geisteswissenschaft'*, 204–11.

broadly aimed at proving German superiority in the fields of the humanities and culture and in some sense therefore the right of Germany to dominate Europe, particularly Eastern Europe. The 'Aktion' organized an enormous number of publications in many fields—English and Romance language studies, history, philosophy, oriental studies, law, and others. Among the participating art historians were Dagobert Frey, Wilhelm Pinder, Richard Sedlmair, and Karl Maria Swoboda. Their efforts were also aimed at promoting the historical argument for German 'influence' outside Germany, and therefore to claim German cultural dominance in Bohemia, Moravia, Northern Italy, and elsewhere.[21] In the absence, as yet, of a systematic study of the Nazi era of German and Austrian art history, it might be ventured that National Socialism on the whole did not place much value on the profession. Although there were instances of opportunism from within the field—while art was deemed important for Nazi Germany, art history was less highly regarded.

For this reason, it may have been possible after 1945 simply to replace all undue emphasis on the German and Germanic with 'Occident' and 'Occidental' ('Abendland' or Europe, to be less emphatic) after the war.[22] Quite a number of large projects, the *Reallexikon der deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, founded in 1940 by Otto Schmitt, or Alfred Stange's *Deutsche Malerei der Gotik* ('German Gothic Painting'), of which only the first three volumes were published before 1945, could continue for decades with only slight changes in emphasis and choice of words.[23] Hans Sedlmayr's *Verlust der Mitte* ('Loss of the Centre') with its anti-modernist diatribes, and conceived of before and during the war, was published in 1948, when its author was unable to obtain a teaching position because of his

---

[21] Hausmann, '*Deutsche Geisteswissenschaft*', 208–11.

[22] The concept of 'Abendland' (Occident) was highly fraught with the ideology of European dominance and its colonial connotations. While in one sense for German scholars after the War it meant to promote the post-war role of Germany as a nation among all the others, it seems obvious today that the ease with which it could be substituted for the ideas of German dominance speaks to its ideological kinship with the ideology of the 1930s and 1940s. It should be noted also that the 'Occident' was not only a German preoccupation. The first international Congress of CIHA in Germany after the war was fittingly devoted to *Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes.* See *Akten des 21. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte in Bonn 1964/International Congress of the History of Art*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1964). After the devastation of the foundations of European civilization, it was not only German art historians who felt the need to reassert basic principles like 'style', 'tradition', 'art', and 'Occident'. Our ability to criticize these principles first required these structures to be restored.

[23] Alfred Stange, *Deutsche Malerei der Gotik*, 11 vols. (Berlin, 1934–61).

Nazi involvement in Vienna.[24] It was a steady seller all through the 1950s and 1960s.

Hubert Locher and Regine Prange's studies of the development of the discipline are written from a new vantage point.[25] As in other areas of the history of the discipline, these two systematically ambitious accounts owe their perspectives to changes in the larger context of the humanities, where, during the last decades, master narratives have been deconstructed and critically dismantled. Locher situates the history of art history in the larger developments of the intellectual and disciplinary practice of art history, while Prange explains the emergence of a separate discipline of art history in the philosophical context of aesthetics. Locher's detailed and at the same time sweeping account takes a look at the practice of art history, how, for instance, epochs and genres were systematically developed under the overarching category of 'style'; how the great series of handbooks were conceptualized and visualized in print; and how the changing practices of exhibiting and displaying works of art shaped the discipline, which in turn shaped new perspectives and put them into practice. A new look at these practices also brought to light the eminent role of reproductions, both as slides and photographs, in research and teaching, and generated—and continues to generate—new, and less idealistic, perspectives on the history of the discipline, and on the art-historical canon that is taught and communicated to the public.[26]

Today, art history in German-speaking countries remains a self-confident discipline, incorporating new approaches all the time while also being somewhat conservative, for instance with regard to queer studies, feminist theory, and global art studies. Because of its long tradition, and its relatively large market, it can afford to remain, to a degree, independent of anglophone, American-dominated art history, while at the same time absorbing into translation some of its (and France's) most important books and studies. It might be noted that books and articles published in major European languages are still used from the undergraduate level in teaching and of course from then on as a matter of course.

---

[24] Hans Sedlmayr, *Verlust der Mitte: Die bildende Kunst des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts als Symbol der Zeit* (Salzburg, 1948).

[25] Regine Prange, *Die Geburt der Kunstgeschichte: Philosophische Ästhetik und empirische Wissenschaft* (Cologne, 2004). Hubert Locher, *Kunstgeschichte als historische Theorie der Kunst 1750–1950* (Munich, 2nd edn., 2010).

[26] See, for instance, Costanza Caraffa, ed., *Fotografie als Instrument und Medium der Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin and Munich, 2009).

Since 2005 at least two important centres, lavishly funded, have emerged that can be said to be highly visible throughout Austria, Germany, and Switzerland: One is Basel's national research cluster (Nationaler Forschungsschwerpunkt, NFS), 'Bildkritik. Über Macht und Bedeutung der Bilder' ('Iconic Criticism. The Power and Meaning of Images') concentrating on pictures and images regardless of their artistic status and theorizing the role of the iconic, both historically and contemporary, in the wake of what has been termed the 'Iconic Turn'. The second institution is the Humboldt University's institute which even changed its name to 'Institut für Kunst- und Bildgeschichte' (Institute for the History of Art and the Image) indicating a shift to 'Bildwissenschaft' and 'Bildgeschichte'.[27] Among its recently founded satellites is the Hermann von Helmholtz-Zentrum für Kulturtechnik (Hermann von Helmholtz Centre for Technology and Culture) where the scientific image and visualizations are studied with methodologies that originated in more traditional contexts and are developed in terms of a broader history of science.

Art History in German-Speaking Countries Today

Germany, Austria and Switzerland are federal republics, and in this account, Germany, a federation of eleven 'Länder' (regional states) before 1990, since then, sixteen, will be used as an example for purposes of describing the discipline quantitatively. All matters concerning universities and education, in fact the entirety of cultural politics, are exclusively the responsibility of each of the Länder. Additionally, cities and local councils ('Gebietskörperschaften') bear the brunt of financing museums, theatres, opera houses and so forth, for about 82 million Germans. Although there are obvious disadvantages in terms of implementing policies, all attempts to change this situation, even only with respect to higher education, have failed. Germany (but also, of course, Switzerland), is multi-centred, which guarantees cultural diversity within the limits of the constitutional law of the Federal Republic. At regular intervals, the federal government sets up funding programmes for its changing priorities in higher education, but federal politics with regard to higher education, especially in the humanities, is only ever implemented in fits and starts, a situation that could not

---

[27] See Matthew Rampley, 'Bildwissenschaft: Theories of the Image in German-Language Scholarship' in this volume, 119–134.

be more different from England and France, and most other European countries. For the following quantitative assessments, we used data from the Statistisches Bundesamt (the federal government's statistics administration), from individual universities, from the monthly *Kunstchronik*, perhaps the only reliable source of them all. We looked at the years 2000–3 to answer the question: what figures can we come up with for art history as an institution in Germany?

Art history is taught mainly at universities, but there are also (increasingly important) chairs at art academies (Berlin, Munich, Stuttgart, and Brunswick ambitiously joining the traditional academies) and at large technical universities, as, for example, in Munich and Aachen, where architectural history is especially important to serve the departments of architecture and architectural engineering. Art history is taught by art historians, architectural historians and design historians in about fifty institutions. Fewer institutions have what could be called an Art History Institute, about thirty-five of them. Among them there are small institutes with two professors or even only one and a number of additional teaching staff, a smallish library and around 200–500 students. Medium-sized institutes will typically have three to seven faculty, as well as additional, mostly temporary, lecturers, and a library of about 60–70,000 volumes, around 500–700 students (majors only) which would be characteristic of a little less than a third of the German art history departments and institutes. Some of these middle-sized institutes, especially those in larger cities, may have more students and fewer staff. Large institutes are few in number: Berlin, The Free University and the Humboldt University, the Ludwig-Maximilans-Universität in Munich, and the University of Bonn. The Free University has a faculty of around fifteen to eighteen professors of varying seniority and as many research staff, tenured as well as temporary, funded in part by federal money for certain projects. There were 850 students enrolled (majoring in art history) in the winter semester of 2005/06 at the Free University. Students of the three art history institutes in Berlin may attend seminars at all universities, the Free, the Humboldt and the Polytechnic University. At any given moment, over 1,500 students of art history are enrolled in Berlin alone.

It is impossible to state the exact numbers of students of art history in Germany, as they are statistically lumped together with art students. Their number grew up to the mid-1990s and is now steady at around 12,000, of which almost 10,000 are women. My estimate is that around 7,000 to 8,000 students out of these study art history. Every year, there are more than 1,000, perhaps 1,300, beginners, a good number of whom began studying

another discipline and moved to art history after a couple of semesters.[28] During the three years from 2001 to 2004, between 650 and 700 students annually took their MA degrees; of these, a decreasing number go on to graduate work: more than 200 doctoral degrees were awarded in the year 2000, just under 200 in 2001 and just over 160 in 2002. It is interesting to note that before their MA exam women outnumber men by a ratio of 4:1, while at the doctoral level the ratio goes down to 3:1. Very few foreigners take their degrees in Germany; in Hamburg, however, there is a steady trend of students coming from Russia, Georgia, Poland, Hungary and other Eastern European countries. In Vienna in particular, numerous students also come from Eastern and Southeastern Europe.

Before the implementation of the consecutive BA and MA courses, students took around ten semesters before they passed their MA exams. Strikingly, the number of beginners used to be halved by the time of examinations. These numbers are very difficult to keep track of. All one can say is that only about half of those who begin to study art history in Germany will finish their studies with an examination in the field of their first choice. These figures must be a nightmare for planners and politicians—much effort and money are channelled to an unaccountable end. These 8,000 students are taught by around 500 faculty and some more temporary teaching staff, fewer than half of them professors. The ratio of students to academic staff is around 1:50 and up to 1:70; it is no wonder, therefore, that one sometimes loses sight of individual students. As a reminder of how small the field really is in terms of numbers, here is a comparison: over 700 scientists are currently working at the Alfred Wegener Institute for Climate Research in Bremerhaven alone.

While there are great differences in the way art history is taught at different universities—again, the 'Länder' have different regulations— overall, the German system ideally requires four semesters of basic training, an intermediary examination after that, four more semesters of more advanced studies, followed by an MA thesis and written and oral exams during a last semester or, more realistically, during the last year, adding up to five years in all. The consecutive BA plus MA programmes will also add up to five years of studying art history. What distinguished MA programmes in Germany from those in most other countries was the weight given to the supplementary study of a second discipline (or two further

---

[28] These fluctuations may decrease due to the introduction of consecutive BA and MA courses.

subjects.) This has now been reduced by about half; but the second field still figures in the new curricula. An art history student may choose for the other required 50% (or 25%) from archaeology and literature to anthropology, law, psychology or even business studies. Seminars on different levels, lecture courses and excursions (teaching in front of original works of art or architecture both abroad or in Germany) are the most common forms of teaching. The most important tool of learning for students is the *Referat* and the *Hausarbeit*, often already very specialized papers on themes either given to them or, at the graduate level, self-chosen. Both curricula and syllabi are largely the responsibility of individual professors, and a far-reaching freedom in the organization of teaching prevails. Topics of seminars are still relatively freely chosen and will reflect the interests of individual professors, even at beginners level.

Between 1994 and 2004, around 6,500 art history MA degrees were awarded in Germany, and over 1,500 doctoral degrees. These figures may even be on the conservative side. For a university career, another degree used to be officially required, and informally still is: the *Habilitation*, usually arrived at on the basis of a second book on a different topic from that of the doctoral thesis: another three to six years of research. Annually, between fifteen and twenty young art historians are 'habilitiert' ('enabled') to be qualified for a university career in professorial positions (these are numbers also checked for 2006 and 2007). Within ten years, then, around 200 art historians compete for approximately 30 to 40 open positions. It should be added that the 'Habilitation' which is essentially a process of co-optation into a group is surely responsible for the institutionally conformist tradition of the profession in Germany. If we look at the membership of our professional association, the Verband deutscher Kunsthistoriker (founded in 1948), of about 2,300, this is an astonishing figure. There are doubtless more art historians in the profession than there are members of the Verband, but even if there are perhaps 3,000 professional art historians in Germany, it seems obvious that those highly qualified in the profession far outnumber available capacities of employment in traditional fields. It is on the whole fair to say that human resources are abundant and that they are, accordingly, used ruthlessly in all areas where young art historians hope to land a full-time position. Before this (assuming they eventually secure a position) they normally work for years under conditions and for a salary that are below most salaries of the clerical staff in the same institutions. Many questions arise from these figures but there is little hard evidence to go by: how do all these hopefuls finance up to eight years of study for the doctoral degree and around five to six for the

Master's degree? Stipends are rare, but cannot be quantified. While higher education in Germany is relatively inexpensive for students, it still seems a large investment in a very insecure future.

Where do all these young art historians go? Traditionally, there are three main professional fields: museums, universities, and 'Denkmalpflege', the care for historical monuments and sites, which is, again, solely the responsibility of the 'Länder'. Traditionally, the media also used to absorb a fair number of graduates. While the new 'Länder' initially absorbed a considerable number of art historians on all levels after 1992, it is now becoming clear that the extension cannot be financed by matching economic growth. There are fewer and fewer jobs in museums and 'Denkmalpflege' (after an expansion, to be sure), and the same is beginning to happen in universities. Of the 4,716 museums in Germany, there are only 476 specialized art museums. Many more than those 476 will be employing art historians but their number may be no more than around 2,000. What has to be left out here—although it would be extremely important to do this—is a precise sense of the budgets involved for the main institutions in the field, but reliable figures for these are almost impossible to come by.

Apart from universities and academies, museums, and sites and monuments, there are a small number of further institutions shaping German art history. The Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte in Munich, for instance, is mainly notable for its important library, and is responsible for the *Kunstchronik*. There is also the Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, founded in 1913 as part of the Art History Institute of the University of Marburg. Officially called the Deutsches Dokumentationszentrum für Kunstgeschichte ('German Centre for Art Historical Documents'), it is a service and, of late, also a research institution, hosting a photographic archive of more than 1.5 million photographs of important monuments. There are furthermore the two German institutes in Rome and Florence, the Hertziana and the Kunsthistorisches Institut. Both host large specialized art-historical libraries and provide important research possibilities through scholarships and jobs for young German scholars who specialize in Italian art history. All these institutions are funded in a complicated compound of federal and regional funds; they have certainly had a stabilizing, perhaps conservative role in German art history with their strong traditions, their own year-books and many decades of continuity. A newcomer to these is the Deutsches Forum für Kunstgeschichte in Paris, founded in 1997 and both financed federally and sponsored privately. Its emphasis on communication, workshops, symposia and conferences as well as publications as a

policy to introduce itself and establish close links with French institutions is already bearing fruit.[29]

Continuity is of course an important concern. The Verband deutscher Kunsthistoriker has organized biennial conferences since 1948, but it was not until the 2002 conference in Hamburg that the discipline's Nazi past was given a prominent place on the agenda for the first time. Since the 1980s, historiography has been an important topic at, for example, the institute in Hamburg (the emigration of art historians in the 1930s and 1940s), and, of late, in Halle, and in Berlin (art history during the Nazi period). For many decades, however, the consciousness of a heroic past on the part of German(-language) art history in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was an important factor shaping the physiognomy of the field in fundamental ways. It meant that a strongly conservative tradition of methodologies and subject matter was generally able to continue until the mid-1980s and beyond, and that modern and contemporary art only recently entered the curricula. Where the art of the twentieth century has been admitted, it may have been in part at the expense of medieval art history. Feminist art history is taught in Berlin and Trier, and two very small institutes in Bremen and Oldenburg, having only arrived at this state of institutionalization in the mid-1990s. There is still a strong regional emphasis (as is to be expected with the 'Länder') in many institutes: Munich has had a chair of Bavarian art history for decades; Hamburg and Kiel have one each for the art history of northern Europe; the Upper Rhine and Lake Constance areas are taught prominently in Freiburg; and so on. Only three institutes have chairs for the history of Asian art: Berlin, recently, Bonn and Heidelberg. They are hardly a presence in German art history. Other parts of the world are not represented, something that might change in the near future in view of recent trends.

Looking through the last ten volumes of the *Kunstchronik*, one is struck by the enormous breadth of topics of both Master's and doctoral theses. Around a stable core of traditional themes (Italy, individual artists) there are clear signs that art history in Germany encompasses the arts of all of Europe and, occasionally, beyond, all genres, including photography and film, new and very recent developments in the contemporary arts,

---

[29] All three institutions provide webstes at http://www.khi.fi.it/ (Florence), http://www.biblhertz.it/default.htm (Rome), http://www.dtforum.org/ (Paris); (accessed 20 September 2010).

text-image relations, the history of the discipline and questions of aesthetic theory. A glance at the invaluable documentation in the *Kunstchronik* clearly shows a quiet transition from the traditional field of research almost exclusively centred on *historical art* (emphasis on both historical and art) and its sources, toward a broader concept of art history and a wide variety of topics and methodologies. The present tendency is obvious: art history in Germany and the other German-speaking countries is alive and well, not least because the discipline is profiting from the general shift towards the study of the contribution of the image to the shaping of culture.

The Profession's Sense of Self

There are a number of publications that can give us an indication of the sense of Self of German-speaking art history.[30] The volume *Kunstgeschichte. Eine Einführung* ('Art History. An Introduction') was first published in 1986 and is now in its sixth edition. Hans Belting, Heinrich Dilly, Wolfgang Kemp, Willibald Sauerländer and Martin Warnke as editors brought together a group of art historians to introduce the field, its institutions, its methods, its skills and its aims as discipline and as a professional field. This collective effort came at a point when the major art history handbooks (Pelican, Propyläen) would have had to be revised, while it was felt that general surveys could not adequately represent the field any more.[31] However, 1986 is a while ago, and since then further introspections

---

[30] Hans Belting, Heinrich Dilly, Wolfgang Kemp, Willibald Sauerländer, and Martin Warnke, eds., *Kunstgeschichte: Eine Einführung* (Berlin, 1986; 7th edn. Berlin, 2008); Werner Busch, Katharina Krause, Karl Prümm, and Barbara Welzel, 'Kunstgeschichte an deutschen Universitäten', *Kunstchronik: Monatsschrift für Kunstwissenschaft, Museumswesen und Denkmalpflege* 57 (2004) 269–75 and Ekkehard Mai, Harald Siebenmorgen, and Rainer Sörries 'Zur Lage der deutschen Museen', 313–21; Beat Wyss and Anne-Marie Bonnet, 'Statements zur Gegenwart und Zukunft der Kunstgeschichte', *Kunsthistorische Arbeitsblätter: Zeitschrift für Studium und Hochschulkontakt* 7/8 (2004) I, 81–8 and 9 (2004) II, 55–60.

[31] In an editorial 'Art history or *Kunstgeschichte*?' *The Burlington Magazine* 129 (1987) 643–4, Caroline Elam analysed the situations in both Britain and Germany. Impressed by the relatively slender book, she stressed that in Germany art history is a respected and recognized academic discipline—in contrast to Britain. She saw at its core the specialist skills of the art historian taught to undergraduates right from the beginning, a sense of value and importance of those skills of the art historian, including methodology, firmly anchored in the individual object and its requirements—something, she claimed, that would only be admitted at graduate level in Britain. On the whole, Elam favourably and almost with envy compares *Kunstgeschichte* to Art History, in particular because the discourse on compet-

have been published. In 2004, two separate efforts were made to look at the discipline as a whole. This in itself—the collective sense of responsibility for the field, both on the side of those who organized the survey and on the side of the contributors—speaks to the fact that the discipline is in better shape than some of its members are aware of, in view of undeniable problems.

The May, June and July issues of the *Kunstchronik* of 2004 were devoted to the state of affairs of the discipline in 'Denkmalpflege', museums and universities. The tenor is one of alarm and a sense of crisis and threat. One might say that in Germany the inclination to see change as a threat is in itself a problem, and not only for art history. With notable exceptions, such as when one museum director remarks on the obvious growth of demand for what his museum has to offer its public, or when one professor who holds a chair in an institute for art teachers describes demands not yet met for a more far-flung education in art history both of art teachers and students in the secondary school system. The only contribution to the *Kunstchronik* that dealt with 'hard facts'—about the imminent demise of 'Denkmalpflege' in Bavaria—was contradicted strongly by an article two months later; it is nearly impossible to know what the trend here is in Germany as a whole. The history of the last sixty years of the care and lack of care and over-care for historic monuments and sites, the revisions and re-revisions of the definition of what constitutes our heritage, and particularly the budgets and professions involved, would in itself be worthy of an in-depth study. Again, the situation has drastically changed since 1990. The picture one comes away with from these contributions to the *Kunstchronik* is inconclusive.

In 2004, a relative newcomer to the scene (initiated in 1999), the *Kunsthistorische Arbeitsblätter* (Working Papers in Art History), also asked a number of art historians, most of them professors at universities (one at an art academy) to give their assessments of the 'Presence and Future of Art History'. Their responses were published in the 2004 August and September issues of the *Arbeitsblätter*. While they were nuanced and thorough, two themes can be said to dominate them. Foremost on almost everybody's mind was the imminent change to the BA/MA system (in line with the Bologna accords) with its concomitant changes, including doing away with second subjects ('Nebenfächer') the introduction of modules,

_____

ing methodologies is counterbalanced with and not in opposition to 'art history' as a body of knowledge.

frequent exams, the streamlining and regulation of teaching, the illusory promise that, after three years, an art history BA degree could qualify anyone for anything at all (the 'job market'). The relatively high number of doctoral degrees still acquired, for instance, has to do with the qualifications museums and other public institutions (twenty-five years since the introduction of the compulsory MA degree) still expect of their curatorial staff.

The second area of concern was what could be called the larger cultural change toward the higher importance of the image and visuality, bringing with it an increased interest in visual culture within many disciplines. The seven statements published by the *Arbeitsblätter* were unanimous in their acknowledgement of the fact of that change but differed in their responses. Some emphasized the sense of crisis in the field while identifying various areas for which in their view changes must be implemented. This concerned the adaptation of some of the prominent issues from predominantly Anglo-American discourses, such as the post-colonial, the anti-universalist, and gender-based approaches and methodologies. Some argued that the linguistic paradigm of art history, the idea of the image as text must be questioned and replaced by a new analysis of meta-picturality. The overwhelming sense was, however, that art history *as* art history can and must accommodate new subjects and objects in the measure of our changing ideas of what art is or can be and what images are, while not letting go of the study of its history, whether or not it has come to an end, and that art history can and must hold on to its present generously and inclusively defined perimeter as a field of varied specializations around architecture, objects, images, and practices of the visual of many ages and kinds.

The call to adopt new methodologies is perhaps a periodical occurrence, a symptom of a continuous process of adaptation of any field or discipline, defined by one of the contributors as 'an institutionalized hypothesis'. Such hypotheses must be revised from time to time, and if 'crisis' is understood as a moment of choice and change, then such moments are necessary in an otherwise regulated system. On the whole, neither 'Kulturwissenschaft' nor 'Bildwissenschaft', nor attempts at renaming the field of art history or even subsuming it as the study of a special case: art, in part proposed to express a broadening outlook, have as yet been able to replace art history. Art history in Germany seems implicitly to take on what elsewhere is called visual studies as its own domain, while retaining its roots in history and established methodologies. However, attempts at

renaming and redefining, in response to the demands of the day, have brought about much necessary discussion, albeit sometimes conducted with missionary zeal. This debate is changing the discipline over time, and 'Bildwissenschaft', 'Bildanthropologie', and 'Kulturwissenschaft' will find their proper and useful place within the discipline of art history, which could be said to be traditionally, and of necessity, a 'house with many mansions'. At least in part, some claims to disciplinary self-re-invention belong to the realm of the sociology of disciplines: they have almost as much to do with the race for attention and funding as they are reflections of epistemological shifts.

ART HISTORY AND VISUAL STUDIES
IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Griselda Pollock

Introduction

In a BBC Radio talk given in October 1952, the architectural historian, Nikolaus Pevsner (1902–1983) offered his 'Reflections on Not Teaching Art History'.[1] Born in Leipzig, Pevsner had studied at the universities of Leipzig, Munich, Berlin and Frankfurt am Main (PhD, 1924) and had taught at Göttingen (1929–33) before he came to England that year and found positions, first at Birmingham University and, in 1959, at Birkbeck College (London), where he initiated its first art history studies, but only as complementary to history or modern languages. A Department of History of Art was formed in 1965, after his retirement. Between 1949 and 1955, Pevsner was Slade Professor of Fine Art at Cambridge University where he discovered that although he could deliver lectures, he could not teach art history: 'For my subject, the history of art and architecture, does not exist at Cambridge as an academic subject pursued to attain a degree and start a professional career. Nor does it exist at Oxford.'[2]

Such a state of affairs would surprise anyone coming from almost any European country, Latin or North America. Pevsner added: 'Everywhere the history of art is established as an academic subject; only in Britain it is not.'[3] The condition of art history in Great Britain and Ireland is anomalous, full of the eccentricities Pevsner later identified as characteristic of art in Britain in *The Englishness of English Art* (1955).

The study of art in Britain emerged from the precocious work of seventeenth-century *virtuosi*, or connoisseurs, such as Jonathan Richardson (1667–1745), and antiquarians in the eighteenth century and writers such

[1] Nikolaus Pevsner, 'On Not Teaching Art History', *The Listener* (30 October 1952) 715.
[2] Pevsner, 'On Not Teaching Art History', 715.
[3] Pevsner, 'On Not Teaching Art History', 715. On this history, see Julian Gardner, 'L'enseignement de l'histoire de l'art au Royaume Uni', *Revue de l'Art* 125.1 (1999) 5–7; Stephen Bann, 'The History of Art History in Britain: A Critical Context for Recent Developments and Debates', in *History and Historians in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Peter Burke (Oxford, 2002) 205–29.

as William Hazlitt (1778–1830). During the nineteenth century it took a distinctive turn towards a moral or political aestheticism with John Ruskin (1819–1900), William Morris (1834–96) and Walter Pater (1839–94), while many renowned, independent scholars published important studies: Joseph Crowe (1825–96, collaborator with Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle), Anna Brownwell Jameson (an early iconographer, 1794–1860), Elizabeth Rigby Eastlake (1809–1893, the translator of Gustav Friedrich Waagen and Franz Kugler into English, as well as prolific author of works on Italian art), Emilia Pattison Dilke (1840–1904, specialist on Renaissance and French Art of the eighteenth century), Charles Eastlake (1839–1906, Director of the National Gallery, author of *Materials for a History of Oil Painting* (1847), and John Addington Symonds (1840–1893, author of *The Life of Michelangelo Buonarotti*, 1893).[4]

Despite such important publications, art history was not established at a university during the nineteenth century with the exception of Edinburgh, where Gerard Baldwin Brown (1849–1932), was appointed to the newly created Watson Gordon Chair of Fine Art in 1880 (held until 1930). Between 1853 and 1866, however, lectures were given on medieval art at University College, London by the minor poet, German political exile and rival of Karl Marx (who attended the lectures), Johann Gottfried Kinkel (1815–1882) who had been Professor of Art History at Bonn University before the revolution of 1848 caused him to flee.

In 1869, Felix Slade (1788–1868), a collector of glass, books and engravings and fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, endowed Professorships in Fine Art at Oxford and Cambridge and at London University (later connected to the Slade School of Art, founded 1871).[5] These posts were not initially occupied by professional art historians, there being none formally trained as such in Britain. John Ruskin was the first Slade Professor at Oxford, while architect Matthew Digby Wyatt and painter Edward Poynter took the other two Slade positions, followed by artists, museum scholars and art writers. The Slade School of Art only began to provide its art students with art-historical studies at the turn of the twentieth century, when Dugald S. Macoll and later Roger Fry were employed as part-time

---

[4] On Anna Jameson and Emilia Dilke, see Claire Richter Sherman with Adele M. Holcombe, *Women Interpreters of the Visual Arts 1820–1979* (London, 1981).
[5] There have been no women Slade Professors at the Slade, six at Cambridge, but none before 1967, and four at Oxford, the first in 1989. The first woman professor in British or Irish Art History was Anne Crookshand at Trinity College, Dublin. The second was Marcia Pointon at Manchester in 1992.

lecturers. A Slade Professor, painter Henry Tonks, enabled an endowed Chair in art history (Durning-Lawrence) to be established in 1914 whose first holder, until 1947, was the Finnish art historian Tancred Borenius (1885–1948). He lectured in art history, but to art students.

Historical interest in art was, nonetheless, disseminated during the nineteenth century by publications of both monographs and articles in a range of journals (*The Art Journal*) and cultural quarterlies (*The Atheneum*) as well as by the growth of museums. The National Gallery in London was founded in 1824, the Victoria and Albert Museum in 1852, the National Gallery of Scotland in 1859, the National Gallery of Ireland in 1854, opening in 1864. Museum collection, conservation and documentation required the development of validation and attribution expertise and comparative knowledge. Until 1903, however, there was no dedicated art publication in Britain to meet such a need. With the foundation of the *Burlington Magazine: A Magazine for Connoisseurs*, a nascent British art-historical community declared its allegiance to late-nineteenth-century scientific connoisseurship shaped by engagement with the forensic methods of Giovanni Morelli (1816–1891) whose key work on Italian painters was translated into English in 1893 by Constance J. Ffoulkes, a critic and colleague of the predominant figure in British art writing, Roger Fry (1868–1934). Anxious about degenerating contemporary art taste and the varied dangers of different kinds of ill-informed collecting, the first editorial declared the magazine's ambition to be of service, by scientific analysis and sound, knowledgeable aesthetic judgement based on the extensive study of 'ancient art', to the 'sincere *amateur*, a true lover of the arts', concluding:

> Finally, then, we may hope—or at least endeavour—to remove a curious and shameful anomaly, this namely, that Britain alone of all the cultured European countries, is without any periodical which makes the serious and disinterested study of ancient art its chief occupation. The anomaly is all the more surprising in that the great English aristocratic collectors of the last two centuries showed an independence of judgement, a subtlety of taste, such, that even now, in spite of recent predations, England remains a place of pilgrimage for lovers of the finest creations of past times.[6]

---

[6] 'Editorial', *Burlington Magazine* 1.1 (1903) 5. The editorship of this magazine includes some of the dominant figures (critics, scholars and museum directors) in the British art world, including Herbert Read, Charles Holmes, Benedict Nicholson, Caroline Elam and Neil MacGregor. Special issues for March 2003 and February 2004 reflect on aspects of the magazine's history.

The Connoisseur: An Illustrated Magazine for Collectors had in fact been founded in 1901 but *The Burlington Magazine* had far more scholarly purposes. Major battles were fought amongst its authors including Bernard Berenson over the difficult (and expensive) questions of attribution and authenticity. In 1909, Roger Fry, at the time the main rival to Berenson in the connoisseurial study of Italian art became its editor, just one year before his major conversion to the study of modern art.

In 1910, with Desmond McCarthy and Clive Bell, Roger Fry organized the exhibition 'Manet and the Post-Impressionists' at the Grafton Galleries in London. Despite the generally hostile response to this first attempt to engage general British culture (rather than selective artists and critics who had studied in France) with modern art, this exhibition was decisive for art history. The earliest collectors in Britain of modern French painting were the Welsh sisters, Gwendolyn (1882–1951) and Margaret Davies (1884–1963) who began their collection in 1908; by 1924 they had the largest collection of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist work in Britain.[7] Through their modernist collecting, with Fry's two Post-Impressionist exhibitions (1910 and 1912), textile magnate Samuel Courtauld (1876–1947) began collecting modern French art, leading to the foundation of the first institute for the academic study of art history in Britain. In 1932, together with Sir Robert Witt, a collector of drawings, and Viscount Lee of Fareham, Courtauld created an institute for the professional training of art historians offering a primary service to museums, galleries and collectors. Even at this institute's birth there was no unequivocal embrace of art history as an academic study, or as a university discipline connected to the larger Humboldtian curriculum in the German sense. The Courtauld Institute remains both the premier institute of art history in Britain and the site of a continuing struggle over its meaning as a specialism within or apart from the general humanities. Courtauld and Lee also rescued the Warburg Library from Hamburg in 1933. Bringing the library and several of its key staff members to Britain injected into British culture the example of intellectually rigorous and methodologically systematic German *Kunstgeschichte* as well as the challenge to it posed by Aby Warburg's *iconological* project and his concept of *Kulturwissenschaft.*

Aspiring art historians in Britain turned to these refugees and the Warburg library in order to engage more profoundly with art, its histories, and its social, cultural and intellectual roots. The most notable of these

---

7   John Ingamells, *The Davies Collection of French Art* (Cardiff, 1967).

was Anthony Blunt (1907–1983) who had been initially deeply influenced by Fry and Bell during his school years and French studies at Cambridge. He now sought more culturally intricate approaches to the visual arts. Blunt became Director of the Courtauld Institute only in 1947 when he consolidated it as a teaching and research institute. In the absence of any candidates with undergraduate studies in art history, Blunt encouraged potential art historians to defect from classics, history, archaeology or Modern Languages. These formed the first generation of professional academic art history teachers at the Courtauld during the 1950s.

The next two university History of Art Departments were founded in 1948 at Glasgow and Leeds in 1949. One was formed at Oxford in 1955. Seven more appeared during the 1960s, thirteen during the 1970s, one in the 1980s, five in the 1990s and four since 2000.[8] This pattern, and its uneven spread, underlines both how young the discipline is in Britain and how it is, even now, still emerging and changing shape under intellectual and institutional pressures. Taught as a distinct subject or domain within the humanities, or as an adjunct to fine art, film or design, the attached table reveals its unstable positioning as an autonomous discipline, variously placed in faculty groupings. In Scotland, art history is placed with Divinity, Philosophy and History (Aberdeen), or Arts and Divinity (St Andrews). In others it is placed in faculties of Languages, Cultures and Music (Birmingham, although there it is also housed within the Barber Institute of Fine Arts, founded in 1932 as a museum and concert hall), of Humanities and Comparative Studies (Essex), Drama, Film and Visual Culture (Kent), Art, Design and Architecture (Kingston), Arts, Cultures and the Environment (Edinburgh), in a School of Histories and Humanities (Trinity College, Dublin), or of History (University College, Cork), of Arts and Social Sciences (Northumbria where the subject is taught in a division of Visual Arts as Art History, Design and Visual Culture). In others, art history emerged in adult education programmes (Hull and Birkbeck College in London), while historical study also found its way into British universities through art education and the art school (Edinburgh and Aberystwyth are very early examples). Until 1992, seven universities housed art history within practice-based Departments of Fine Art (Leeds, Edinburgh, Reading, St Andrews, Newcastle, the Slade School of Art in

---

8 This increase reflects the major extension of the British University system in the 1960s. It is interesting to note the presence of art history in most of the new foundations (Warwick, East Anglia, Sussex, Essex, Kent and York).

London University and Aberystwyth). Art history in Britain has, therefore, been formed in complex relations to journals, collecting, museums, art education, and post-1960 university restructuring, the teaching of art and design and increasingly conservation and museum studies.

Professionalization of art history has evolved slowly over the twentieth century. An Irish Association of Art Historians (AAH) was founded in 1972, and set up its own journal, *Artefact*, in 2007. An Association for Art Historians in the United Kingdom was formed in 1974 with 600 members; it now has 1,225. Organizing an annual conference, the AAH launched *Art History* in 1978 to provide a more open and inclusive forum for scholarly publication and debate in English in distinction to the connoisseurial *The Burlington Magazine* and the scholarly *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, first published in 1937 by the Warburg Institute, joining with the Courtauld Institute in 1940, which now declares its mission to publish 'new research of a documentary and analytical character, in the field of cultural and intellectual history'. (*Kulturwissenschaft* recently finding an accepted, if inadequate, English translation.) Indicative of the radical expansion and new orientations typical of the 1970s two other journals emerged: The *Oxford Art Journal* was founded in 1978 and *Block* was initiated in 1979 and edited by a group of critical art and design historians at Middlesex Polytechnic (later University) for over ten years.[9]

In the 1990s Visual Culture emerged, loosening its bonds with disciplinary art history. Supported by a *Journal of Visual Culture* (since 2002), its growing influence is indexed also by the inclusion of 'Visual Culture' in the naming of two academic centres for art history, (Goldsmith's College, London and Manchester University). Challenging Eurocentrism in art history the journal *Third Text* offered *Third World Perspectives on Contemporary Art and Culture.* Founded in 1987, it challenges 'the ground on which the West establishes itself as the ultimate arbiter of what is significant in the field of art and visual culture' and provides the critical and scholarly space for international and postcolonial studies in the visual arts, creating an English-language meeting point for international theorizations of modern and postmodern art. Another distinctive presence has been feminist studies whose journals included *feminist art news* and *Women's Art Journal* later named *MAKE* (both defunct) and the most vital print and

---

[9] For a collection of representative articles, see Jon Bird, Barry Curtis, Melinda Mash, Tim Putnam, George Robertson, Sally Stafford, and Lisa Tickner, eds., *The Block Reader in Visual Culture* (London, 1996).

on-line journal *n.paradoxa*, founded by Katy Deepwell in 1997 as an 'international feminist art journal exploring feminist theory and contemporary women's art practices'.[10] Jewish studies in art history also emerged in the 1990s led by Eva Frojmovic (Leeds) and Juliet Steyn (Kent). Queer studies has also a strong presence through the work of Adrian Rifkin, Gavin Butt, Lynn Turner, and Simon Ofield. The focussed studies of British or Irish art are associated with specific universities (Dublin, Cork, and Leicester where a focus on British art history was supported by the Paul Mellon Foundation).

Receiving its major intellectual boosts from two waves of continental migration—one of persons and ideas in the 1930s and another in the 1970s of theories and methods—art history in Britain and Ireland has a curiously uncertain and yet vividly combative sense of itself and of the challenging issues of thinking through the relations between art and history, aesthetics and philosophy, materiality and meaning, with powerful engagements on issues of difference (ethnic, sexual, gendered and cultural). Its lack of a hegemonic nineteenth-century foundation has been responsible for its experimental energy and disciplinary flexibility, while its roots in the connoisseurial tradition vividly shape the continuing significance of museum art history represented by the inclusion of the Tate's Research Division (Modern and Britain) in the current control by Research Assessment Exercises and the Research Excellence Framework (RAE and REF).

Historical Perspectives: Migration

The fledgling field of art history in Britain was intellectually marked by the arrival of the Warburg Institute and Library and the refugee scholars who came in its wake who were supported in the continuation of their academic careers through the energies of its indefatigable members, notably Fritz Saxl and Gertrud Bing. Rudolph Wittkower taught at the Warburg Institute in 1934–56 before leaving for Columbia University; Helen Rosenau who had studied with Wölfflin, Adolph Goldschmidt, Paul Clemen and Panofsky finally received her doctorate from the Courtauld in 1940, and worked with Karl Mannheim until she gained a post at Manchester University; Johannes Wilde was a student of Max Dvořák, who came to Britain through Kenneth Clark, catalogued major national and royal collections,

---

[10] http://web.ukonline.co.uk/n.paradoxa/ (accessed 12 August 2010).

lecturing at and becoming the Deputy Director of the Courtauld Institute 1948–58; perhaps most famously, Ernst Gombrich, who arrived in 1936, finding work at the Warburg Institute where he would rise from research fellow to become Director in 1959–72. A close friend of fellow émigrés, Friedrich Hayek and Karl Popper, Gombrich facilitated the English publication of the latter's *The Open Society and its Enemies* (1945) but is best known for *The Story of Art*, published in 1950, running now to sixteen editions and translated into over thirty languages. With *Art and Illusion* (1960), which proposes an art history based on the psychology of perception, *The Story of Art* represents a major strand of art history in Britain that was critically contested during the 1980s when a convert from literary studies, Norman Bryson, drew on French structuralist art theory to challenge Gombrich's opening statement: 'There is no art, only artists.'[11]

In 1969 the new left historian Perry Anderson declared 'Britain, the most conservative major society in Europe' pointing out that, alone of all its major European and even American neighbours, Britain never produced a classical sociology. This reflected British culture's commitment to empiricism, aversion to theoretical systems, and widespread anti-intellectualism. While the influx of European émigrés following 1933 considerably enriched British cultural and intellectual life, Anderson identifies the selective character of this migration to Britain, noting that those from the German philosophical tradition—the Hungarian Marxists or the Frankfurt School—did not come to Britain.[12] Instead, Anderson defines a 'White' migration that included Popper, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Lewis Namier, Hans Eysenck, Isaiah Berlin and Gombrich.[13]

Exceptions in art history are Friedrich Antal and Arnold Hauser, the latter arriving in Britain from Vienna in 1938, being employed at the University of Leeds in 1951 and, later, at Hornsey College of Art, London. Antal, known to Hauser from their joint membership of the *Sonntagskreis* in Budapest with Mannheim, Béla Balázs, Béla Bartók and Gyorgy Lukács, fled to Britain in 1933 and was befriended by Anthony Blunt, then a strongly Marxist thinker. As a result of his Marxist views, Antal,

---

[11] Norman Bryson, *Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze* (New Haven, CT, and London, 1986). See also Ernst Gombrich, *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography* (Oxford, 1970).

[12] Daniel Snowman, *The Hitler Emigrés: The Cultural Impact on Britain of Refugees from Nazism* (London, 2002).

[13] Perry Anderson, 'Components of the National Culture,' *New Left Review* 50 (1968) 3–57. Karl Mannheim was the exception.

however, never received a university position although he lectured part-time at the Courtauld until his death in 1954. One of the major signs of the deep conflict in British art history as a result of the diversity within this European migration was the hostile review by Gombrich of Antal's major work *Florentine Painting*, published in *Art Bulletin* (1953), while the left-wing painter and art critic, John Berger delivered a personal tribute to Antal on his death in the *Burlington Magazine* in 1954.

In 1967, Gombrich's lecture 'In Search of Cultural History' mounted a sustained critique of Hegelian/Marxian models for the study of culture which he considered too systematic and teleological. Gombrich argued for cultural history as an attentive awareness and valuing of continuities with the past, asserting in exemplary fashion as a result of the singular position he alone enjoyed as Director of a research institute bearing the name of Warburg:

> If the cultural historian lacks a voice in academic councils, it is because he does not represent a technique, a discipline. Yet I do not think he should emulate his colleagues from the departments of sociology in staking a claim to a method and terminology of his own. For whatever he may be able to learn from this and other approaches to the study of civilizations and societies, his concern, I believe, should still be with the individual and particular rather than with the study of structures and patterns which is rarely free of Hegelian holism. For the same reason I would not want him to compete for the cacophonic label of an interdisciplinary discipline, for this claim implies the belief in the Hegelian wheel and in the need to survey the apparently God-given separate aspects of a culture from one privileged centre. . . . We cannot afford this degree of professionalization if the humanities are to survive at all.[14]

Antal had offered an analysis of art history in Britain as he encountered it in an essay first published in the *Burlington Magazine* in 1949.[15] He was critical of local backwardness:

> The whole point of view of art historians who have not yet even absorbed the achievements of Riegl, Dvořák and Warburg (let alone tried to go beyond them) is conditioned by their historical place; they cling to older conceptions, thereby lagging behind at least a quarter of a century. And in the same

---

[14] Ernst Gombrich, *In Search of Cultural History* (Oxford, 1969) 46–7.

[15] Frederick Antal, 'Remarks on the Method of Art History', *Burlington Magazine* 91 (1949) 49–52, 72–3, also appended to his collection of papers on *Essays on Classicism and Romanticism* (London, 1966) 175–89.

way, they are conditioned by the concessions they are willing to make—not too many and not too soon—to the new spirit.[16]

Writing in a still politically charged moment of post-fascist anti-communism which saw in anglo-phone art history the triumph of Wölfflinian formalism on the one hand, or Panofsky's humanistic pacification of iconography on the other, Antal noted a refusal amongst British art historians of social or materialist explanations of artistic practice that might impinge on the idealizing story of great individuals, creating universally significant, beautiful objects. Patronage studies were allowed only for the minor artists. Reference to popular culture similarly was to be kept at a distance from the major names. Discussion of subject matter was confined to an esoteric kind of iconography remote from what Antal called living history, while any relation between art and history or art and society must be left allusively vague with no real engagement with any of the major sociological theories. He then stated:

> The last redoubt which will be held as long as possible is, of course, the most deep rooted nineteenth-century belief, inherited from Romanticism, of the incalculable nature of genius in art. . . . Methods of art history, just as pictures can be dated.[17]

Antal's diagnosis of the continuing dominance of empiricism and formalism infused with remnants of aestheticism and Romanticist cults of expressive genius in mid-twentieth century British art history marks a historical point of maximum alienation between art history and the sociological imagination, an alienation against which the second generation of the 1970s would productively revolt.[18]

Paradoxically, the immigrants inspired research into the history of British art (Pevsner and Antal in particular). Anderson's and Antal's diagnoses of a British phobia about social history remain pertinent. In 1982 a Canadian, David Solkin organized an exhibition of the eighteenth century Welsh artist Richard Wilson at the Tate Gallery which was viciously attacked by critics for 'sullying' British art by linking art with ideology and class, a theme that John Barrell's *The Dark Side of Landscape: The Rural Poor in English Painting 1730–1840* (1983) would consolidate less

---

[16] Antal, *Essays*, 187.
[17] Antal, *Essays*, 189.
[18] Griselda Pollock, 'Thinking Sociologically/Thinking Aesthetically: Between Convergence and Difference with some Reflections on Sociology and Art History', *History of the Human Sciences* 20.2 (2007) 141–75.

controversially but with no less impact. As recently as 2003, an exhibition on Thomas Gainsborough curated by Michael Rosenthal (Warwick) and Martin Myrone at the Tate Britain again incited controversy, indicating the continuing struggle between heritage and national identity and critical trends in scholarly research.

The continental migration to Britain shaped the major presses which now sustain English-language publication of both scholarly and popular art history. Phaidon Verlag, later Press, was founded by Bela Horowitz (1898–1955) and his son-in-law Ludwig Goldscheider in Vienna in 1923. Phaidon began publishing illustrated art books in 1936 but relocated to London after 1938. Thames and Hudson was established in 1949 by the émigré Walter Neurath (1903–1967). Both served scholarly and popular markets, with Phaidon publishing Gombrich's *Story of Art* in 1950 and Thames and Hudson initiating the *World of Art* series in that decade. These presses not only fostered interest in art but provided both the necessary outlets for art historians through publication and the stimulation of a public for the subject. More recently, Reaktion Books has created a space for critical practices in art-historical writing, while the publisher Routledge has been hospitable to more theoretically oriented studies in visual culture and interdisciplinary studies in art history, theory and film.

Warburg and the European Legacy

Michael Baxandall (1933–2008) was the British art historian most distinctively formed by, yet resistant to, the Warburg tradition in Britain and influential in his own right.[19] Studying English at Cambridge under Frank R. Leavis, Baxandall joined the Warburg Institute in 1958, working in its photographic collection and completing a doctorate supervised by Gombrich. He became a Keeper at the Victoria and Albert Museum (1961–65) returning to teach at the Warburg Institute. A series of major publications: *Giotto and the Orators* (1971), *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy* (1972), *The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany* (1980), and *Patterns of Intention* (1985), established Baxandall as an outstanding and original thinker about both the rhetorical aspects of art and the complex

---

[19] Adrian Rifkin, editor of *Art History*, initiated a series of special issues of the journal dedicated to influential figures in the discipline. *About Michael Baxandall* (1999) was the first volume.

cultural contexts and social conditions of its visual and material production. With the concept of the 'period eye', Baxandall subtly proposed the cultural construction of vision and is credited with having laid one foundation for the emergence of visual culture studies.

Michael Podro (1931–2008) was also the product of English studies under Leavis followed by the study of drawing at the Slade School of Art before turning definitively to philosophy (at the University of London) for a dissertation on *Konrad Fiedler's Theory of the Visual Arts* co-supervised by Gombrich, Alfred J. Ayer, and Richard Wollheim. Although never employed at the Warburg Institute, Podro was intellectually within its ambit, while at the same time teaching art history and theory at Camberwell School of Art and Crafts, and establishing close links between art history and fine art practice. In 1969 Podro moved to the newly founded Department of Art History and Theory at the University of Essex where his philosophical aesthetics made it a unique centre studying the philosophical underpinnings of art theory. His major publications were: *Manifold in Perception: Theories of Art from Kant to Hildebrand* (1972) and *The Critical Historians of Art* (1982). One of his students was Margaret Iversen, whose *Alois Riegl: Art History and Theory* (1993) marked an important English-language study of a then little known, understudied and incompletely translated historian of the formative European generation around 1900. Engagement with European aesthetic philosophy and the Central European schools of art-historical thought has been continued with recent research by Matthew Rampley (Birmingham) and Richard Woodfield (Birmingham) editor of the on-line *Journal of Art Historiography* launched in 2009.[20]

The Psychoanalytical Turn

The other major émigré to Great Britain with a direct influence on art and art history was Sigmund Freud. Freud arrived in London in June 1938 only to die in September 1939. Engagement with psychoanalysis was notable in the work of critic/painter Adrian Stokes (1902–1972) and philosopher Richard Wollheim (1923–2003). Stokes was educated in philosophy and classics, and later became a painter. Critical to his development was an encounter with Ezra Pound in Italy and the psychoanalysis of Melanie

---

[20] University of Birmingham, 'Journal of Art Historiography', arthistoriography.word press.com (accessed 20 December 2011).

Klein (1882–1960). Stokes's Kleinian studies of art included: *The Quattrocento: A Different Conception of the Italian Renaissance* (1932) and *The Stones of Rimini* (1934). He later wrote essays on Cézanne, Monet and Raphael and a psychoanalytical reading of Michelangelo (1955). The most complete synthesis of his use of Kleinian psychoanalysis was *Painting and the Inner World* (1963). Wollheim rescued Stokes's work in a collection in 1974 and 1978 as he shared a deep involvement with psychoanalytical aesthetics as part of his larger philosophical orientation in the study of the visual arts. Professor of Mind and Logic at the University of London, Wollheim produced several extremely influential texts, including *Art and its Objects* (1968) and *Painting as an Art* (1987) while also being responsible for coining the phrase 'Minimal Art' (*Arts Magazine* 1965). Following feminist interests in psychoanalysis, Margaret Iversen deploys it in her historical and contemporary studies on Edward Hopper and Mary Kelly, culminating in *Beyond Pleasure: Freud, Lacan and Barthes* (2007). At the intersections of art history, cinema studies and feminist theory, Griselda Pollock has consistently worked with psychoanalysis, sexual difference, and aesthetics, while Mignon Nixon fosters Kleinian studies of contemporary art, notably by women.[21]

Anthony Blunt (1907–1983) and the Courtauld Institute

Although still a ghostly figure, marked by the disgrace in his old age of being exposed in 1979 as the 'fourth man' in a Soviet spy ring—despite a secret confession in 1962—Anthony Blunt is clearly a major, charismatic and yet perplexing figure in the history of British art history. Initially enthralled by Roger Fry's aesthetics and Clive Bell's concept of 'significant form', Blunt first studied mathematics at Cambridge before turning to Modern Languages. During the 1930s, Blunt became a Marxist. Marxism for his highly educated elite was not political so much as the expression of a revulsion against the insulated philistinism and social cruelty of elite British society during the Depression. Blunt turned to the Warburg émigrés to learn the rich intellectual history of art history. He worked at the Warburg Institute in 1937, later declaring: 'I'd never done a day's training

---

[21] Griselda Pollock, *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism and Histories of Art* (London, 1988); Pollock, *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories* (London, 1999) and Pollock, ed., *Psychoanalysis and the Image* (Boston, MA, and Oxford, 2006); Mignon Nixon, *Fantastic Reality: Louise Bourgeois and the Story of Modern Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2005).

in art history. There was no means of doing so in this country. . . . Coming into the professional atmosphere was of enormous importance to me. In five minutes one learnt more from Saxl than in an hour from anyone else.'[22] Blunt was formed by Saxl, Wittkower, Wind and his close friend, Antal, as well as learning from Wölfflin's student and one of Panofsky's teachers, Walter Friedlænder (1873–1966). Once he began to lecture at the Courtauld, Blunt transmitted a new quality which students recognized: 'something different from the gentlemen connoisseurs, combining both the models of rigorous scholarship and passionate commitment to meaning in art and the meaning of art in face of barbarism.'[23]

Political orientation may have led Blunt to the appreciation of leftist Picasso and modern art which he combined with his major interests in art theory of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in art and architecture of France and Italy, notably Naples, and with his long-term commitment to the restoration of Poussin's reputation as a philosophical painter. Once director of the Courtauld, Blunt had to build the first, if always fragile, edifice of a systematic academic institute for the undergraduate teaching and advanced study of art history across the full range of periods and approaches. Thus only from the 1950s onwards were there formally trained art historians becoming both museum directors (Alan Bowness, and, in the next generation, Nicholas Serota—both at the Tate Gallery—and Neil MacGregor—at the National Gallery and subsequently the British Museum) and university lecturers. Many students of Blunt's Courtauld were to found the subject and/or departments at other universities such as Michael Jaffé in Cambridge, Peter Murray at Birkbeck College, and Peter Lasko at East Anglia. Lasko followed Blunt as Director of the Courtauld Institute (1974–85). Meeting the challenge of both its eminent role in the field and the challenge of new trends and expanding theoretical engagements, the Courtauld Institute has been revitalized in recent years by a new generation of scholars who now extend the full range of art-historical studies into the contemporary field. Former Deputy Director, Renaissance specialist Patricia Rubin, now Director of the Institute of Fine Arts in New York, initiated a Research Forum with a varied programme of collaborative conferences, lectures, fellowships and advanced research training. Since 2007, the Forum has reflexively focussed research on 'Writing Art History' and on 'Art History and the Photographic Archive'. Listed topics

---

[22] Miranda Carter, *Anthony Blunt: His Lives* (Basingstoke, 2001) 210.
[23] Carter, *Anthony Blunt*, 219.

for recent Masters' students reveal both increasing research into modern and contemporary art and the changing nature of art-historical studies even in the classical field.

Art Schools and Polytechnics

One distinctive feature of British art history results from intimacy with the practice of art. From Borenius at the Slade onwards, art history has been taught with fine art. Artists Maurice de Sausmaurez, Quentin Bell, and Lawrence Gowing were the first three heads of the Department of Fine Art at the University of Leeds. Art history had been introduced in 1949, but it was swiftly supplemented by fine art practice by Bell, who believed that art history could only be seriously studied through the experience of practice. Gowing was both a leading painter of the Euston Road School and the author of studies on *Vermeer* (1952) and *Cézanne* (1988). An independent degree course in History of Art was finally established at Leeds with a graduate programme in the Social History of Art in 1978 by the first non-practitioner Professor of Fine Art at Leeds, T. J. Clark (1974–79).

The teaching of art history was considerably expanded by the effects of the Coldstream-Summerson Report on Art Education (1960) which made fine art an academic degree—a Diploma in Fine Art—largely taught in independent art schools that were at the time being slowly assimilated to the newly instituted Polytechnics.[24] The report stipulated that at least 20% of the curriculum must include academic study of critical, historical and contextual subjects. Where art history was an adjunct to creative practice, the Polytechnics created a demand for art historians, but not of the antiquarian/connoisseurial kind. Some key developments in art history were thus facilitated by the relative intellectual freedom provided by the Polytechnics from the limitations of traditional (if newly instituted) academic art history curricula, combined with the necessity to challenge a historical perspective on art with its daily production in a changing contemporary context that included fine artists, photographers, graphic designers, and filmmakers. Not only was a focus on modern and contemporary art inevitable, but also the focus on fine art and its histories

---

[24] On the recommendations of the National Advisory Council on Art Education, known as the Coldstream-Summerson Report, see Clive Ashwin, ed., *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768–1975* (London, 1975).

was expanded to include design, photography, cinema and contemporary popular culture, which was increasingly a part of contemporary art practice itself. Methodological innovation and intellectual breadth were both stimulated, and, quite frankly, needed, in order to engage potential artists with critical studies of art and visual cultures, past and present.

Critical self-awareness as practising artists in changing cultures demanded a different kind of art-historical complement. Exemplary of this trend was Hornsey School of Art, site of major student revolts after 1968, which became, in 1973, part of Middlesex Polytechnic (now University).[25] In 1979 the art and design historians constituting its critical studies staff produced a new magazine *BLOCK*:

> a result of an initiative taken by a group of artists and art historians who believe that there is a need for a journal devoted to the theory, analysis and criticism of art, design and the mass media. Our primary concern is to address the problem of the social, economic and ideological dimensions of the arts in societies past and present.[26]

The magazine was both a site for publication of new models of art history that were deeply engaged with contemporary theoretical debates about semiotics, ideology, museology, critical theory and feminism, and a space for the publication of articles by artists similarly engaged with critical questions such as Terry Atkinson of Art & Language. It also offered space for articles on film, video and photography before dedicated journals appeared as registers of these new areas of research and practice.

Significant Formations Since 1970

One signal event in the 1970s was the *televisual* contest between Kenneth Clark and John Berger. Clark, a protégée of Bernard Berenson, though influenced by Aby Warburg in his iconological study, *The Nude* (1956), had been curator at the Ashmolean Museum and was later Director of the National Gallery. Active in the founding of independent television in Britain, he worked with the BBC in 1969 to broadcast the first ever docu-

---

[25] For a recent history of these events see Lisa Tickner, *Hornsey 1968: The Art School Revolution* (London, 2008).

[26] 'Editorial', *Block* 1 (1978) 1. See Neil Mulholland, *The Cultural Devolution: Art in Britain in the late Twentieth Century* (Aldershot, 2003) who named *BLOCK* 'a manifestation of the cultural logic of a newly self-conscious, historicized and politicized initiative in the cultural realm; and a simultaneous, allergic reaction to the idealism of art history'. Art History is no longer taught as such at Middlesex.

mentary in colour: *Civilization: A Personal View*, a survey of Western art since the dark ages. This not only catapulted Clark to international fame, it also made art history and the art historian visible to the British public. *Civilization* was to the television age, what the Kugler/Waagen surveys of the history of art had been to the pre-photographic age. Clark's patrician, sexist, Eurocentric and aestheticizing interpretation incited an equally influential response from Berger, the realist painter, novelist and committed Marxist humanist art critic. In 1972, Berger broadcast *Ways of Seeing* (published also as a book) which used the Warburgian idea of the *Bilderatlas* or picture atlas. Berger also openly engaged with Walter Benjamin's essay, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproducibility'.[27] Though ruthlessly critiqued by Art & Language for his reductivist claim that 'seeing comes before words', Berger's analysis of gender hierarchies—expressed succinctly in the dialectic of 'men act: women appear. Men look at women. Women watch themselves being looked at'—and his comparative iconography across high art and pornography were influential in the formation of feminist and visual cultural analyses.[28]

Social, Critical, Feminist and Post-Colonial Histories of Art

British Art History's distinctive features after 1970 were born of both intellectual discontent with existing empirical and positivist trends and also the creative energies generated by close contact with the upheavals of contemporary art at the 'end' of modernism and the major intellectual revolutions centred on Paris: structuralist Marxism (Althusser), structuralist psychoanalysis (Lacan), semiotics (Barthes), post-structuralism (Kristeva) and deconstruction (Derrida). Through the emerging domain of film/cinema studies led by the journal *Screen*, British intellectuals embraced continental philosophy and Critical Theory. *Screen* became a conduit for French theory and debates about psychoanalysis, semiotics and feminism that provided an alternative, extramural education for many art historians trapped in the models offered by Blunt's Courtauld Institute and dislocated from earlier continental traditions, by then esoterically immured in the Warburg Institute. The co-emergence of a reclaimed social history of art

---

[27] Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproducibility', in Benjamin, *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn, ed. Hannah Arendt (London, 1970) 219–54.

[28] John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (Harmondsworth, 1972) 47. For a critique see Special Issue *Ways of Seeing, Art-Language* 4.3 (1978).

and of *Screen*, based on shared structuralist and post-structuralist recoveries of Marx, Brecht, and Freud, was inflected by new social movements of queer, feminist and postcolonial subjects offering even deeper critiques of the axes of power around race, gender and sexuality encoded in image and discourse and in dominant, academic formations of knowledge.[29]

We can identify two new generations: one formed around 1970 by social, queer and feminist histories of art, and another emerging in the 1990s, as students of, as well as contestants to, their teachers from the 1970s who taught them. While, clearly, art history continues to build on its original if belated institutionalization and the Courtauld Institute retains its academic reputation, one very distinctive aspect of the British situation is the intensity of the revolt, echoing that of Antal in 1949, against what appeared by 1970 to be, however flimsy, a limiting, museum- and market-serving 'establishment'. In part, the conditions of Blunt's veiled and disowned Marxist past, his subsequent identity as Keeper of the Queen's Pictures, and the cultural tendencies identified by Perry Anderson, ensured that scholarly art history was selective in its uses, and rare formal teaching, of the intellectual traditions of the Austro-Hungarian-German schools of the turn of the century. In 1974 T. J. Clark, who studied history at Cambridge and entered art history as a graduate student at Oxford and the Courtauld (PhD 1973), wrote a scathing attack on anglophone art history. He suggested that the discipline was, if not 'in crisis', then 'out of breath or in a state of gentle dissolution'. Looking back to Lukács for whom art historians such as Riegl and Dvořák had counted amongst the really important *historians* of their period, Clark suggested that what had gone wrong was the failure to ask important questions such as:

> What are the conditions of artistic creation? Should we substitute for it notions of production or signification? What are the artist's resources, and what do we mean when we talk of an artist's materials—is it a matter, primarily, of technical resources, or pictorial tradition, or a repertory of ideas and the means to give them form?[30]

Asking difficult questions had been replaced, according to Clark, by choices that selectively addressed only some aspects under the rubric of

---

[29] For an internally contested account of the 'moment' of the social history of art, and film studies see Fred Orton and Griselda Pollock, 'Memories still to come . . .', in Orton and Pollock: *Avant-Gardes and Partisans Reviewed* (Manchester, 1996) i–xxi.

[30] T. J. Clark, 'On the Conditions of Artistic Creation', *Times Literary Supplement* (24 May 1974) 562, reprinted in Eric Fernie, ed., *Art History and Its Methods: A Critical Anthology* (London, 1995) 248–53.

'method': namely formalism, iconography and patronage. Clark wanted to foster once again a more dialectical mode of thinking that could track the moment when ideas, conditions, interests became form:

> What I want to explain are the connecting links between artistic form, the available systems of representation, the current theories of art, other ideologies, social classes, and more general historical structures and processes.... If the social history of art has a specific field of study, it is exactly this—the processes of conversion and relation, which so much art history takes for granted. I want to discover what concrete transactions are hidden behind the mechanical image of 'reflection', to know *how* 'background' becomes 'foreground'; instead of analogy between form and content, to discover the real network of real, complex relations between the two. These mediations are historically formed and historically altered; in the case of each artist, each work of art, they are historically specific.[31]

Citing Panofsky's early work on *Perspective as Symbolic Form*, Clark echoes a loss, mourned also by French art historian, Georges Didi-Huberman, of Panofsky's confidently German *philosophical* framing of the stakes involved in asking questions about art, meaning and histories. Clark regretted the disappearance of a paradigm in art history and proposed his own, a reclaimed and transformed sense of social histories of art, informed by post-Communist readings of the Marx of 'The Eighteenth Brumaire' and the introduction to the rediscovered *Grundrisse*, Situationism, Lacan and structuralism as a new paradigm.[32] It is in this context that Clark made, however, a provocative and difficult remark:

> It ought to be clear by now that I am not interested in the social history of art as part of a cheerful diversification of the subject, taking its place alongside other varieties—formalist, 'modernist', sub-Freudian, filmic, feminist, 'radical', all of them hot-foot in pursuit of the New. For diversification, read disintegration. And what we need is the opposite: concentration, the possibility of argument instead of this deadly co-existence, a means of access to the old debates.[33]

Clark's critique of the attempted pacification of the challenge posed by social or other histories of art by a commodification of fierce arguments as merely a plethora of available 'methods and approaches' is well aimed.

---

[31] T. J. Clark, 'On the Social History of Art', in Clark, *The Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution* (London, 1973) 12.

[32] For another account of the moment of the social history of art see Orton and Pollock 'Memories Still to Come...'.

[33] Clark in Fernie, ed., *Art History and its Methods*, 250.

It echoes Adrian Rifkin's disowning of the attempt to identify such real critiques as part of a 'New Art History': a fashionable conference topic or publishing gimmick.[34] That there are real stakes in art-historical argument and interpretation was also asserted by Fred Orton and Griselda Pollock in their critique of the intellectual poverty of a major modernist exhibition on Post-Impressionism.[35] Clark's denunciation, however, of the potential disintegration of art history caused by what he considered distracting feminist, queer and postcolonial challenges to established Euro-American art histories was deeply contested in favour of a more generous sense of the art-historical resources for studies of difference.

Adrian Rifkin, a student of émigrés: Edgar Wind, Helen Rosenau and Arnold Noach (Leeds) abandoned university art history in 1976 under the joint influences of the French intellectual journal *Tel Quel* and the street politics of cultural Maoism in order to teach history to art students at Portsmouth Polytechnic. Alliances forged with the key journal and study group, the *History Workshop*, brought together dissident scholars from various strands of the British New Left who were developing another brand of social history alert to phallocentrism, racism and heteronormativity. What shaped art-historical developments around 1970 cannot only be understood by these extra-mural, actively political and intellectually adventurous alliances, organized around reading French theory, open to debates about modernism and postmodernism, in the United States later focussed on *October* magazine, and mediated by journals such as *Screen, Tel Quel* or *History Workshop*. A sense of community and, often, of violent disagreement generated a new excitement and sense of connection between art, art history and social life, and contemporary issues. The stinging review by Rifkin of Clark's second major publication, *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers* (1984), titled 'Marx's Clarkism', asserted that far from being a Marxism saved by the author's love of art (accusations made by conservative reviewers), Clark's Marxism was a 'social history pulled into shape to serve the history of art'. Clark permits no deviation from 'the central authority of the masterpiece

---

[34] Adrian Rifkin, 'Art's Histories' in *The New Art History*, ed. Alan L. Rees and Frances Borzello (London, 1986) 157–63. See also Jonathan Harris, *The New Art History: A Critical Introduction* (London, 2001) who was obliged by the publishers to use this now current phrase, while it is utterly misleading and was contested from the start.

[35] Fred Orton and Griselda Pollock, 'Les Données Bretonnantes: La Prairie de Représentation', *Art History* 3.3 (1980) 314–88.

in his discourse'.[36] In conjunction with his Benjaminian model for a history of Paris, Rifkin's learned, but acerbic, critique internalized the emergent feminist deconstruction (Derrida) of the ideological foundations of art history as a discursive formation based on the master and the masterpiece, feminism building on Antal's 1949 critique of the persistent Romantic attachment to genius, exemplified in Gombrich's assertion of art history as only the history of artists.[37] In *Street Noises* (1993), fruit of a prolonged exploration of French archives of the everyday, song, entertainment and cultural figurations of urban social and sexual relations, Rifkin enacted a historical reading of things and images, sounds and practices that resisted the artist-focussed cornerstones of art history and the modernist narrative of heroic masculine avant-garde struggle. Rifkin's culturally expansive queered art history also engaged with the eccentric/central figure of Jean A.D. Ingres to generate another narrative of modernity in *Ingres: Then and Now* (2000) which appeared in a series, edited by Jon Bird and Lisa Tickner, former *Block* editors, that also included Griselda Pollock's *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories* (1999). There, drawing on psychoanalytical aesthetics, Pollock extended the originating feminist deconstruction effected in collaboration with Rozsika Parker in *Old Mistresses* (1981), countering both racism and homophobia, to argue that a canon of great white men artists is held in place, not merely by ignorance of the existence of women artists, but by masculine narcissistic investment in, and identification with, the Artist as ideal Hero.[38] Another major feminist art historian, Lisa Tickner, contributed to this richly theorized, historically rigorous analysis of visual representation and the political with her classic study, *The Spectacle of Woman: Imagery of the Suffrage Campaign 1907–1914* (1987).

Other significant art historians developing feminist studies include Anthea Callen, another artist/art historian, who has worked on women in the design as well as feminist readings of Degas and of the representation of the human body; Tamar Garb, noted for her studies of women artists and institutional politics of gender in art education in the nineteenth century and other studies on the modernist body; Rozsika Parker, noted for her analysis of women in textile arts and their cultural histories of sex,

---

[36] Adrian Rifkin, 'Marx's Clarkism', *Art History* 8.4 (December 1985) 489.

[37] Roszika Parker and Griselda Pollock, *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology* (London, 1981).

[38] Griselda Pollock, *Avant-Garde Gambits: Colour and the Gender of Art History* (London, 1993).

class and gender. British feminist studies have flowered in many directions maintaining links with social, postcolonial and anti-racist studies in the works of Lynda Nead, Deborah Cherry, Annie Coombes, Tamar Garb, or Caroline Arscott, while also forging novel approaches through conjugating practical understanding of materials and processes in the work of Anthea Callen, Alison Rowley and Vanessa Corby. Black experience informs critical feminist art writing in the art and critical work by Lubaina Himid, Sonia Boyce, Sutapa Biswas, Kobena Mercer and Gilane Tawadros.

If gender, sexuality and class form one major line of argument, the confrontation with racism, and the need for a decentred internationalism is evident in the International Institute for International Art (www.iniva.org), founded in 1994 'to redress an imbalance of culturally diverse artists, curators and writers'. InIVA was initially directed by Gilane Tawadros, who studied art history at Sussex under Norbert Lynton (1927–2000), originally a child refugee from Nazi Germany. Tawadros guided InIVA's first decade with a growing programme of exhibitions, digital projects, education and research, as well as enabling a publications programme that radically challenged the replicating western canon even in modern and contemporary art history. With MIT Press, InIVA launched a series, *Annotating Art's Histories*, taking up Pollock's pluralized 'feminist interventions into *art's histories*' that insisted on a multiplicity of stories/histories in opposition to Gombrich or Clark's monolithic canon: *the* story of art. The intellectual force behind this series is Kobena Mercer (born 1960 in Ghana), based at Middlesex University. The collections he has edited, *Cosmopolitan Modernisms* (2005), *Discrepant Abstraction* (2006), *Pop Art and Vernacular Culture* (2007) and *Exiles, Diasporas and Strangers* (2008), not only forge international links with scholars worldwide but break out of the European/British enclosure of art history and visual culture, by refusing to choose between the two, and by expanding the range of studies, methods, aesthetics, questions, and modes of writing. They register the most powerful impact on contemporary art-historical studies of colonial and postcolonial migrations, diasporas, cultural exchanges, cross-fertilizations, participations, marginalization and, of course, the dual effects of globalization and the shift into liquid modernity.

Some of this echoes with the Irish and other national experiences within Britain (Scotland and Wales), where research into national and regional histories of art and visual culture is being developed while also understanding the impacts of recent traumatic histories in contemporary art and their effects on historical consciousness and expanded, contested cultural perspectives. This is markedly different from concurrent attempts

to propose a world art history without any comparable deconstruction of the very terms of the art history that marginalized the 'rest of the world' in favour of a selective Western masculinist and white tradition. The University of Leeds became identified with Social History of Art in the 1980s, with International and Postcolonial Feminism and the Visual Arts in the 1990s. In 2001, it established a research centre, Centre for Cultural Analysis, Theory and History, whose mission is actively to review the legacy of the Warburg project of *Kulturwissenschaft* informed by feminist, Jewish, postcolonial, and queer engagements with difference while placing art histories in transdisciplinary encounter with creative art practice and philosophical cultural studies including anthropology and psychoanalysis.

Sharing a common language with the United States, British art historians have clearly engaged with the longer-standing academic and museum study of art history in the USA. British art historians have worked and lectured in the US as curators and professors, and regularly contribute to the College Art Association conferences; some American scholars have taught in Britain or Ireland (Patricia Rubin, Mignon Nixon, James Elkins). Institutionally, however, the two traditions are significantly different because of the historical formations and intellectual initiatives outlined above. Some British art historians are renowned for their interdisciplinary approaches and hospitality to theoretically enriched approaches to the study of the image, while the range of initiatives inspired by the new research culture of the Arts and Humanities Research Council indicates a renewed vitality in the full range of topics, periods and methods.

It becomes clear that the dividing lines of varied art-historical practices and visual cultural studies in Britain and Ireland occur not along methodological, theoretical or perspectival lines, but across a recurring fault line already dramatized in European culture at the turn of the twentieth century, when the severance of art as idealized form or creative artistic expression from systematic analysis of the image through iconological and later semiological and psychoanalytical readings (Kristeva's semanalysis) was equally contested and when the search for a complex and expanded understanding of art, meaning, desire, memory, violence, and sociality was grappled with in various major undertakings. If T. J. Clark's trajectory from David, to Courbet, Manet, Cézanne to Pollock and Poussin retains the hallmarks of art history's idealizing masculinism, the radical trajectory of the alliances in Britain between feminism, queer and postcolonial studies in ideology, representation, sexuality and power have generated the space for significant intellectual developments in which those working on

art and its histories face newly difficult questions of the choices between a focus on visual culture/visual studies—inspired by semiotics, Foucauldian discourse theory and deconstruction and very much open to an expanded debate across cultural and critical theory—and the outstanding question of the specificity of the aesthetic, of artistic practice and its conditions, resources, institutions and affects.

BORN OF A 'PERIPHERAL' MODERNISM:
ART HISTORY IN GREECE AND CYPRUS[1]

Areti Adamopoulou

The collocation 'Greek Art' is internationally associated with antiquity. This fact has immensely affected nineteenth- and twentieth-century art production in Greece and its reception. How does one become a 'Greek' artist in modern times when this term is not spatial or temporal but highly ideological? Who may be confident enough to compare herself/himself with the grandeur of a sanctified past which still plays so significant a role in Western historiography? The priority given to ancient, rather than contemporary, art has shaped scholarly choices and concerns as well. What should be the optimal tense of art history in Greece: the past perfect or the present continuous? Who has the authority to produce 'art history' in this context?

The existence of art history as a distinct academic discipline is recent in Greece. Consider: the writer of this text belongs to the third generation of professional art historians to teach the subject in a Greek University. Why was art history such a late arrival in Greece by comparison with other disciplines? Its absence from academia until the 1960s is strange, given that, since the nineteenth century, Greece's national identity was built on its ancient art and history. As we shall see further on, it was not an absence, but a different kind of presence. The same absence, or rather peculiar presence, holds for Cyprus, which forged its national identity in a similar way.

Until the 1980s art history and archaeology in Greece enjoyed, by European standards, an unusual relationship. Archaeology was a favoured field both in the eyes of the Greek state and in those of foreign institutions

active in Greece since the nineteenth century.[2] Important institutions had been founded almost simultaneously with the state: the creation of a National Archaeological Museum was decreed in 1829, the Archaeological Service was established in 1833, the Archaeological Society of Athens in 1837, and the subject has been taught at the University of Athens since 1837.[3] Thus, Archaeology was given the opportunity to grow and become an academic discipline; until the 1990s its members (university professors, students and state archaeologists) enjoyed an elite position in the cultural domain, participated in international discourses, imported and exported students and professionals. By contrast, art history had to assert its rights to independence and self-sufficiency, to differentiate itself from closely related disciplines and to argue for the necessity of its existence; research into anything but Classical and Byzantine art was considered a 'luxury' for Greece.[4]

The history of Hellenism was perceived and taught as a continuous line which connected prehistory to the present, as an uninterrupted succession of language, art and culture, that begun some time in the Bronze Age, flourished during the Classical period, expanded in Hellenistic times, survived the Roman Empire in spirit and carried over to the Christian empire of the Byzantine era. The Ottoman period (1453–1830) was examined as one further step in this timeline and was labelled the 'post-Byzantine period'.

---

[2] On this see Elena Korka, Maria Xanthopoulou, and Eleni Konstantinidi-Syvridi, eds., *Xenes arheologikes scholes stin Ellada: 160 hronia/Foreign Archaeological Schools in Greece: 160 Years* (Athens, 2005); Elena Korka, *Xenes arheologikes scholes stin Ellada: apo ton 19° ston 21° eona* (Foreign Archaeological Schools in Greece: from the 19th to 21st Century) (Athens, 2007). See also Vangelis Karamanolakis, 'University of Athens and Archaeological Studies: The Contribution of Archaeology to the Creation of a National Past (1911–1932)', in *A Singular Antiquity: Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in Twentieth-Century Greece*, ed. Dimitris Damaskos and Dimitris Plantzos (Athens, 2008) 185–95.

[3] On the creation of the National Museum see Michael Fotiadis, 'Ruins into Relics: Classical Archaeology, European Identities and Their Refractions', *Pharos* 9 (2003) 84–6. The Museum did not acquire its own building until 1888. Aggeliki Kokkou, *I merimna gia tis arheotites stin Ellada kai ta prota mouseia* (The Stewardship of Antiquities in Greece and the First Museums) (Athens, 1977); on the Archaeological Society see Vasilios Petrakos, *I en Athines Arheologiki Eteria: I istoria ton 150 hronon tis, 1837–1987* (The Archaeological Society in Athens: The History of Its 150 Years, 1837–1987) (Athens, 1987). On the University see Olga Palagia, 'Ludovikos Ross: O protos kathigitis arheologias tou Panepistimiou Athinon, 1837–1843' (Ludwig Ross: The First Professor of Archaeology at the University of Athens, 1837–1843) in *Ludwig Ross in Greece, Proceedings of the International Symposium, Athens, 2–3 October 2002*, ed. Hans Rupprecht Goette and Olga Palagia (Rahden, Westphalia, 2005) 263–73.

[4] Evgenios Matthiopoulos, 'I istoria tis tehnis sta oria tou ethnous', (Art History within National Borders) in *I istoria tis tehnis stin Ellada*, (Art History in Greece), eds. Evgenios and Nicos Hadjinicolaou (Herakleion, 2003) 419.

Archaeologists of the Classical and the Byzantine period were deemed the appropriate experts to teach art and archaeology in Greek universities. However, a small number among those professional humanists perceived an absence that differentiated the Greek from the European public: only a small cultivated elite had knowledge of Western art. No collection of Renaissance or later art existed in the country. It may have been possible to read about such art but, to have seen it, it was necessary to have been abroad. Archaeologists, philologists, and other literati published essays on Western art, reviewed exhibitions in newspapers and magazines, and delivered public lectures on the subject in efforts to bridge centuries of different traditions. Some of them spoke in favour of the cultivation of art history as a distinct discipline in Greece as early as 1917, and argued for its legitimacy as a scientific field.[5] However, it was only after the Second World War that Greece's European orientation became central to the country's domestic and foreign policies and, accordingly, the study of the European art tradition acquired ideological and political support for its existence in institutions of higher learning.

Archaeology's monopoly of the cultural domain endured longer on Cyprus than it did in Greece. Cyprus was, and still is, considered part of the Greek world, but presents its own case for the purposes of this review because of its different political and institutional history. Its national identity was formed in the twentieth century along the lines of international diplomacy on the sensitive issue of its status as an independent state. The island belonged to the Ottoman Empire from 1570 to 1878 and then became a British colony. The Republic of Cyprus emerged as an independent state in 1960, was divided by force in 1974, and in this status joined the European Union in 2004. Archaeology was crucial for the formation of a Greek-Cypriot identity with deep roots in Hellenic history. Fundamental issues pertinent to art and cultural heritage were treated as they were in Greece. Ancient and medieval Cypriot art was, here too, privileged over contemporary creation. This was, and still is, regarded as the national cultural capital. Cypriots, in similar ways as the Greeks, discovered different aspects of the island's past and promoted them accordingly. The situation was more complex, however, for the island had a longer history of conflicts and invasions and consisted of two major national communities, differentiated in terms of language, religion and culture. The dominant

---

[5] Matthiopoulos, 'I istoria tis tehnis sta oria tou ethnous', 437–9. See, too, Hristos Karouzos, 'Nikou Mpertu: Giotto', *Nea Estia* 10 (1931) 1169–71.

Greek culture turned a blind eye not only to the culture of the Turkish minority, but also to the multiplicity of the traditions of the island.[6] The tensions between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots coloured all discourses on history, cultural identities and cultural heritage.

In the aftermath of the Turkish invasion and the island's military division in 1974, Cypriots rebuilt their cultural life and national narratives within the limits of their mutilated state. In these circumstances, it was the Cypriot rather than the Greek-Cypriot identity that was promoted. Institutions of art and culture were shaped after 1975, on the basis of already existing legislation and institutions. Under the British colonial regime, the first Cyprus Museum had been founded in Nicosia (1882), the first law on antiquities was enacted in 1905 and the Department of Antiquities was established in 1935.[7] As in Greece, in Cyprus too, antiquities attracted the attention of both the national and the international scientific community early on. Numerous foreign archaeological institutes (twenty-eight today) became interested in the island's past, and began excavations at important archaeological sites. The Swedish Expedition initiated this practice in 1927. The art history of more recent eras, as a practice and as a university discipline, was an even later arrival in Cyprus than it was in Greece.

In Greece the first steps towards the institutional recognition of art history were taken in the 1930s, at about the time when the state was becoming interested in the promotion of contemporary Greek art in Europe.[8] In the Athens School of Fine Arts (ASFA) prospective artists had the opportunity to attend a course in 'Aesthetics and Art History'. This course had been erratically taught (by philologists) since the nineteenth century.[9] Finally in 1939, a Chair of art history was officially created, and Pantelis Prevelakis (1909–1986) was appointed to it.[10] Shortly afterwards, Angelos Prokopiou

---

[6] Vangelis Calotychos, ed., *Cyprus and its People: Nation, Identity, and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955–1997* (Boulder, CO, 1998).

[7] The Cyprus Museum, 'The Cypriot Museum History', http://www.cs.ucy.ac.cy/museums/ team6/museum.php?langId=1 (accessed 10 May 2010).

[8] Evgenios Matthiopoulos, *I simmetohi tis Ellada stin Biennale tis Venetias, 1934–1940* (Greek Participation in the Venice Biennale, 1934–1940) (PhD diss., University of Crete, 1997).

[9] Marina Lambraki-Plaka, 'Anotati Scholi Kalon Tehnon. 150 hronia zois', (Athens School of Fine Arts. 150 Years of Life) in *Anotati Scholi Kalon Tehnon. Ekaton peninta hronia, 1837–1987* (Athens School of Fine Arts. 150 Years, 1837–1987) (Athens, 1990) 13.

[10] Anotati Sholi Kalon Tehnon, 'Sintomi istoria tis ASKT', (A Brief History of the Athens School of Fine Arts) http://www.asfa.gr/greek/ASKT/index.html (accessed 10 May 2010). Prevelakis taught at the School until 1974.

(1909–1967) and Dimitrios Evangelidis (1886–1959) occupied comparable chairs in the School of Architecture of the National Technical University of Athens (Ethniko Metsovio Polytehnio).[11] All three men were graduates of the School of Philosophy of the University of Athens, had training in archaeology, became experts in art history by attending courses in France and Germany, and practiced formal analysis, periodization and iconography.[12] They set the structure of the Greek art historian's career: a first degree in archaeology, graduate studies in Western Europe, research on nineteenth- and twentieth-century Greek art. They also constructed, each to varying degrees, the first narratives on academic and modern Greek art. They employed the model of 'leading' European metropolitan centres and 'belated' peripheries in order to explain why Greek artists were not in the avant-garde of European creativity. The centres of influence were, they thought, Munich for the nineteenth century and Paris for the early twentieth. The art produced in the modern Greek State, they theorized, was what came after 'post-Byzantine' art, the next step in the continuum of Hellenic creativity. To bolster this linear narrative, 'Greek' elements would be detected in the works of painters and sculptors. 'Greekness' could be a concrete element such as the choice of subject-matter (e.g. genre scenes of Greek folk life for nineteenth century academic painters, landscapes for modernists) or an abstract quality (e.g. a balanced composition could be seen as an allusion to classical art, a multi-coloured, flat composition could refer to Byzantium or to folk art).[13]

---

[11] Evgenios Matthiopoulos, 'I tehnokritiki sto Mesopolemo. Taseis kai epiroes sti theoria kai tin kritiki tis tehnis tin epohi tou Mesopolemou', (Art Criticism in the Interwar Period. Tendencies and Influences on Art Theory and Art Criticism in the Interwar Period), *I Kathimerini—Epta Imeres*, (8 March 1998) 6–9.

[12] Panayiotis Bikas, 'O theoritikos kai kritikos logos tou Dimitriou Evangelidi', (Theoretical and Critical Thought of Dimitrios Evangelidis) in Matthiopoulos and Hadjinicolaou, eds., *I istoria tis tehnis stin Ellada*, 189–206; Matthiopoulos, 'I istoria tis tehnis sta oria tou ethnous', 419–75; Matthiopoulos, 'Ideoloyia ke tehnokritiki ta hronia 1949–1967: ellinokentrismos, sosialistikos realismos, modernismos' (Ideology and Art Criticism in the Period 1949–1967: Greekness, Social Realism, Modernism), in *1949–1967: I ekriktiki ikosaetia* (1949–1967: the Explosive Twenty Years), ed. Urania Kaiafa (Athens, 2002) 386; Efthimia Georgiadou-Kountoura, 'Istoria tis tehnis' (Art History), in *Filosofiki Scholi Thessalonikis: Ta prota 75 hronia* (Faculty of Philosophy in Thessaloniki: The First 75 years) (Thessaloniki, 2000) 129.

[13] Prevelakis wrote mostly on the work and life of El Greco. Evangelidis incorporated nineteenth- and twentieth-century art in a survey book on Greek art, which started with Creto-Mycenean art and concluded with twentieth-century art. Demetrios E. Evangelidis, *I elliniki tehni* (Athens, 1969; translated by Irvin Ziemann as *Greek Art*: Athens, 1973). Prokopiou was the writer of the first history of nineteenth-century Greek art: Angelos Prokopiou, *Neoelliniki tehni* (Modern Greek Art) (Athens, 1936). He included the nineteenth- and

Critical for the establishment of art history as an academic field was its introduction to schools of philosophy, where students were more likely to appreciate it as a potential career. For some archaeology professors, schools of philosophy were the natural home for the new discipline, for art-historical texts and methodologies were familiar to them and the field seemed to be closer to their own than to literature or art criticism.[14] The key event was the appointment, in 1965, of Hrysanthos Hristou (born 1922) to the Chair of 'History of Medieval and Recent Art' ('Istoria tis Meseonikis ke Neoteris Tehnis') at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.[15] Hristou was the first to write surveys of Western art in Greek (more than a dozen books); he helped local agents to create collections of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Greek art, and gave countless public lectures. Above all, he became the first in Greece to teach at postgraduate level. His work was continued by five of his students, four of whom still teach today at the Department of History and Archaeology in the same University. Hristou became Professor in the (much more conservative) School of Philosophy of the University of Athens in 1978. For two decades (1965–1984) he remained the sole holder of a chair of art history in a school of philosophy, this monopoly being shared with one chair at the ASFA.

Since the arts of Greece from the prehistoric to the Ottoman period were already the territory of archaeology, Hristou confined the field of art history to Western art from the Renaissance on, and to academic and modernist Greek art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Because the latter art was an uncharted area, but also because Greeks had no ready access to Western art, he cultivated the study of Greek art. As art history in Greece aspired to acquiring the characteristics it had in Western Europe, recording and archiving basic information seemed an indispensable first step. Consequently, nineteenth-century 'masters' and, later on, the Greek modernists became the subject of several doctoral dissertations and monographs.[16] Hristou focused his teaching and writings on painting

---

twentieth-century Greek art in a three-volume book on Western art from neoclassicism to abstract art: Angelos Prokopiou, *Istoria tis tehnis, 1750–1950* (History of Art, 1750–1950) (Athens, 1967–1969).

[14] This is the case, for example, for Manolis Andronikos and Hristos Karouzos. Evgenios Matthiopoulos, 'I theoria tis 'ellinikotitas' tou Marinou Kalliga' (Marinos Kalligas' Theory of 'Greekness'), *Ta Istorika* 25.49 (2008) 336.

[15] Athanasios Hristou, 'Hrysanthos Hristou. Viografika', (Hrysanthos Hristou. Biographical Note) in *Hrysanthos Hristou. Afieroma* (Hrysanthos Hristou. An Homage), ed. Efthimia Georgiadou-Kountoura and Antonis Kotidis (Thessaloniki, 2006) 13–25.

[16] E.g. Nina Athanasoglou, *O zografos Nikiforos Lytras* (The Painter Nikiforos Lytras) (PhD Dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1974); Manolis Vlahos, *O zografos*

and sculpture. Architectural history, on the other hand, was incorporated into archaeology courses, or was taught by architects in schools of architecture in survey courses that covered a time span from antiquity to modernity.[17] This rather narrow definition of art history, in terms of time and medium, continues to be the rule in Greece.

It is not by chance that the discipline essentially took shape in Greece in the 1960s. After the Second World War, the Greek state showed a renewed interest in promoting contemporary Greek art, now viewed not as the last step in the long march of Hellenic creativity through the ages but as a field of cultural production in its own right. New institutions were created with the aim of promoting the Western cultural model of art. For example, the Greek branch of the Association Internationale des Critiques d'Art was established in 1950.[18] The National Gallery, owner of a significant collection of Western art, opened its doors to the public in 1976, and foreign institutes (such as the British Council, the Institut français, or the Casa d'Italia) broadened their scope of action to encompass contemporary art and culture.[19] For the first time too, cities outside Athens acquired exhibition spaces, art collections and art appreciation societies. For example, the Macedonian Art Society 'Tehni' (Art) was founded in Thessaloniki in 1951, and municipal galleries were founded in Ioannina (1962), Kalamata (1962) and Rhodes (1964).[20] The market for contemporary art in Greece also expanded, and emulated the structure of its coeval European ones.[21] Alongside the conservative orientation in art criticism and art history

---

Konstantinos Volanakis, 1837–1907 (The Painter Konstantinos Volanakis, 1837–1907) (PhD diss., Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1974); Antonis Kotidis, *O zografos Konstantinos Maleas (1879–1928)* (The Painter Konstantinos Maleas, 1879–1928) (PhD diss., Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1982); Nicos Zias, *I kosmiki zografiki tou Foti Kontoglou* (The Secular Painting of Fotis Kontoglou) (PhD diss., University of Athens, 1985); Matoula Scaltsa, *Gounaropoulos* (Athens, 1990); Nelly Misirli, *Gyzis* (Athens, 1995); For a comprehensive bibliography, see Evgenios Matthiopoulos, Dora Komini-Dialeti and Athina Ragia, eds., *Lexico Ellinon kallitehnon (Zografi, gliptes, haraktes, 16os–20os eonas)* (Dictionary of Greek Artists: Painters, Sculptors, Engravers. Sixteenth to Twentieth Century) (Athens, 2000).

[17] Gülsüm Baydar, 'Teaching Architectural History in Turkey and Greece: The Burden of the Mosque and the Temple', *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 62.1 (2003) 84–5.

[18] See the website of AICA-Hellas, 'History', AICA-Hellas, http://www.aica-hellas.org/histen.html (accessed 10 May 2010).

[19] The website of the National Gallery is http://www.nationalgallery.gr/ (accessed 10 May 2010). See also Matthiopoulos, 'I theoria tis 'ellinikotitas' tou Marinou Kalliga', 336.

[20] Matoula Scaltsa, 'Ethouses tehnis apo ti dekaetia tou '20 os ti dekaetia tou '70 stin Athina', ('Art Spaces in Athens, 1920s to 1970s'), in *Ethouses tehnis stin Ellada* (Art Spaces in Greece), ed. Matoula Scaltsa and Dimitra Tsouhlou (Athens, 1989) 32–3.

[21] Scaltsa, 'Ethouses tehnis', 27–43.

(supported by the state), a left-wing aesthetic was also voiced in the post-1945 period. The two main art journals of this period, *Zygos* ('The Scales') and *Epitheorisi Tehnis* (*'Art Review'*), reflect these opposing trends.[22]

Establishment and Expansion

Further developments were precipitated by important ideological and institutional changes that took place in Greece in the 1980s. In the universities, the once elite position of Chair was essentially abolished. Universities multiplied, and new academic subjects were introduced in newly created departments. At the time of Hristou's appointment in the mid-1960s, Greece had just two universities, in Athens (founded in 1837) and Thessaloniki (founded in 1925). By the turn of the millennium, the number of universities with humanities departments had grown to eleven.[23] Another institutional change occurred in 1984,[24] when philosophy schools were divided into autonomous departments. Although art history did not receive its own department and was still to be taught primarily in departments of history and archaeology and at the ASFA, its ranks grew at a fast pace.[25] Until 1983 the subject had been taught in just two university departments and the School of Fine Arts in Athens. In the period 1984–89 it appeared in the curriculum of fourteen more departments (either as a topic or as a concentration). To these, nine new departments were added by 1999, and another ten by 2008, bringing the total number today to thirty-six. Positions for art historians multiplied from three in 1984 to sixty-five in 2003.[26] Nine of these departments offer five or more different courses in art history (considered as the minimum for a degree orientation in Greece).

---

[22] Nicos Hadjinicolaou, 'Ipodohi ke provoli esthitikon axion ke kallitehnikon taseon apo tin Epitheorisi Tehnis' (The Reception and Promotion of Aesthetic Values and Artistic Currents in Epitheorisi Tehnis), in *Epitheorisi Tehnis: Mia Krisimi Dodekaetia* (Epitheorisi Tehnis: The Crucial Twelve Years), (Athens, 1997) 184.

[23] The newly founded universities were those of Ioannina (1964), Patras (1964), Thrace (1974), Crete (1977), the Ionian University, the University of the Aegean and the University of Thessaly (1984), the University of the Peloponnese and the University of Western Macedonia (2000).

[24] Presidential Decree 445/1984.

[25] All data come from university official press releases and websites.

[26] The last number may vary according to each year's funding and the priorities given by each department, as it refers to positions of both permanent and temporary staff.

Numbers may suggest an increased interest in the subject. But numbers alone cannot prove the growth or decline of a scholarly discipline, nor do they say much about that discipline's centrality or marginality in an academic system. Today art history survey courses are taught in a variety of university departments, but not always by trained art historians.[27] However, it is still in the three oldest departments of history and archaeology (in Thessaloniki, Athens and Crete) and in two fine arts departments (in Athens and in Ioannina) that the subject is taught in depth (at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels) and is treated as a specialization for students. It should be noted, too, that there is as yet still no department in a Greek institution for higher learning that includes 'art history' in its title.

In the 1980s Greek art historians broadened the scope of methodologies they used. Nicos Hadjinicolaou (born 1938), a reputable scholar already at the time of his appointment in the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Crete (1985), contributed much to that. Although tendencies to go beyond formal analysis and biography, and to employ new theoretical tools (e.g. reception theory), were already visible, Hadjinicolaou's appointment marked a turn to the social, or, in his words, Marxist history of art.[28] This approach still flourishes among faculty and students in Crete. He also directed his students to the study of sixteenth- to nineteenth-century European art and not only to academic and modern Greek art. Furthermore, he organized the first conference on art history in Greece (held in Rethymno, 2000), which led to the foundation of the Society of Greek Art Historians, which aimed at becoming a branch of the Comité Internationale d'Histoire de l'Art.[29] The Society has since organized two more conferences (in Athens, 2005 and Thessaloniki, 2007). Open to academics but also to MA graduates, museum curators

---

[27] Art history is also taught in departments of pre-school and primary school education, social anthropology and history, cultural technology and communication, theatre studies, communication and media studies, cultural heritage management and new technologies, product and systems design engineering, audio and visual arts, home economics and ecology, all of which were founded, or stabilized their current character and name, after 1984.

[28] A notable example of the impact of reception theory was Antonis Kotidis, *Modernismos ke 'paradosi' stin elliniki tehni tou mesopolemou* (Modernism and 'Tradition' in Interwar Greek Art) (Thessaloniki, 1993). On Hadjinicolaou's approach see Hadjinicolaou, 'I ' "koinoniki istoria tis tehnis" ', (The 'Social History of Art') *Ta Istorika* 2.4 (1985) 273–75.

[29] Niki Loizidi, 'Isagogiki omilia', (Introductory Address) in *Prosengisis tis kallitehnikis dimiouryias apo tin Anagennisi eos tis meres mas* (Approaches to Art Production from the Renaissance to Our Times), ed. Nicos Daskalothanasis (Athens, 2008) 15.

and freelancers, the Society has begun to play a role in the shaping of the discipline. It provides an institutional space for the discussion of current professional issues, research and teaching problems, and opportunities for an interaction with colleagues from abroad, who are invited to present their work.

Museum policies have also been changing since the 1980s, in line with the Greek state's efforts to modernize itself and its citizens according to European models. The National Gallery is at the epicentre of these efforts. Exhibitions attracting thousands of visitors have been staged since the early 1990s, while exhibition catalogues became large, elegant publications, produced both in Greek and English.[30] In the same spirit, attempts have also been made to re-evaluate Greek modernist and contemporary art and renegotiate its place in the European context.[31] Private foundations have begun supporting Greek art with exhibitions and publications. A private initiative also led to the foundation of the Macedonian Centre for Contemporary Art in Thessaloniki in 1979.[32] By acquiring, little by little, private collections and archives, the Centre soon became a Museum. By the end of the 1990s all major art museums in Greece had updated their exhibition policies. In the meantime, besides establishing new museums, the state showed interest in supporting art institutes when it acquired the Costakis Collection of Russian avant-garde art.[33]

---

[30] The first such exhibition 'From El Greco to Cézanne', took place in 1992. See Angela Tamvaki, ed., *From El Greco to Cézanne: Masterpieces of European Painting from the National Gallery of Art, Washington, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York* (Athens, 1992) (bilingual English-Greek catalogue). Other exhibitions soon followed, such as Jacob Baal-Teshuva, ed., *Andy Warhol, 1928–1987: Erga apo ti sillogi Jose Mucrabi* (Andy Warhol, 1928–1987: Works from the Jose Mucrabi Collection) (Athens, 1993). Nicos Hadjinicolaou, ed., *O Greco stin Italia ke i italiki tehni* (El Greco in Italy and the Italian Art of His Time) (Athens, 1995).

[31] For example: Anna Kafetsi, ed., *Metamorfoseis tou modernou: I elliniki empeiria* (Transformations of Modern Art: The Greek Experience) (Athens, 1992).

[32] Alexandros Xydis, 'Pros ti defteri dekaetia tou Makedonikou Kentrou Sinhronis Tehnis', (Towards the Second Decade of the Macedonian Centre of Contemporary Art), in *Macedonian Centre for Contemporary Art*, ed. Matoula Scaltsa (Thessaloniki, 1992) 15–17: a bilingual English-Greek catalogue.

[33] The State Museum of Contemporary Art, along with the Centre for Contemporary Art, the Photography Museum and the Cinema Museum, were founded in 1997 in Thessaloniki, see The Board of Trustees, 'Foundation of SMCA', State Museum of Contemporary Art, http://www.greekstatemuseum.com/kmst/ museum/foundation.html (accessed 10 May 2010). The Tellogleio Foundation of Art, founded in 1972 as part of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, was housed permanently and thus began to show its collection of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Greek art and to organize exhibitions in 1999: Tellogleio Foundation of Art, 'Profile', http://www.tf.auth.gr/teloglion/default.aspx?page=515 (accessed 10 May 2010). The National Museum of Contemporary Art was founded in 2000

In the 1990s art history in Greece acquired the characteristics of an aca-demic discipline that operates according to international standards. The decline of archaeology as a field for a potentially prestigious (though never financially rewarding) career led many humanities students to choose less conservative and more promising orientations, one of which appeared to be art history. New museums offered resources to researchers and career possibilities. Institutionalized in higher education and in the museum, art history now found state recognition; in 2003, for the first time, art historians were hired by the Ministry of Culture in capacities that archaeologists had monopolized since the nineteenth century. However, the professional identity of the art historian is still not clear within the Greek bureaucratic system.[34]

In Cyprus, art history has not as yet had the chance to flourish as an aca-demic discipline to the extent it has in Greece. It was only after the island's violent division in 1974 that many institutions took shape in the country and acquired a Western European form. The modernization of the state was a priority and the first results became visible at the beginning of the millennium. Until the late 1980s, the Republic lacked universities. Artists and art historians were trained abroad, mostly in Greece and, to a lesser extent, in the United Kingdom.[35] The close link with Greece allowed for people and ideas to move back and forth. Since the 1970s Greek art histo-rians and art critics have included twentieth-century Cypriot art in their purview and have narrated its history in similar terms.[36] Here, too, they traced contemporary art's genealogy to antiquity and to the Greek past of the island.[37] Since the 1980s the Cypriot embassy in Athens ('House of Cyprus') has been active in promoting contemporary Greek and Cypriot art, and the presence in the Greek capital of Cypriot collectors, such as

in Athens. See Anna Kafetsi, 'Director's Foreword', National Museum of Contemporary Art, available online at: http://www.emst.gr (accessed 9 August 2008).

[34] Pantos Pantos, Alcestis Papadimitriou and Angeliki Kossyva *Discovering the Archae-ologists of Europe: Archaeology Labour Market Intelligence: Profiling the Profession 2007–08* (Athens, 2008). Available online at: http://kenny.aitchison.typepad.com/discovering_the_archaeolo/greece.html (accessed 22 September 2010).

[35] All facts on the Educational System in the Republic of Cyprus come from the official Annual Reports (2003–2008) of the Cypriot Ministry of Education and Culture, http://www.moec.gov.cy/etisia-ekthesi/index.html (accessed 2 April 2009).

[36] Hrysanthos Hristou, *Sintomi istoria tis neoteris ke sinhronis kypriakis tehnis* (Concise History of Modern and Contemporary Cypriot Art) (Nicosia, 1983).

[37] See, e.g., the special issue of the newspaper *I Kathimerini*: 'Sinhroni Kypriaki Tehni' (Contemporary Cypriot Art), *I Kathimerini—Epta Imeres* (1 June 1997).

Dimitrios Pieridis and Dakis Ioannou, strengthened the local cultural scene.[38] The Cyprus State Gallery of Contemporary Art, formerly housed in the Cyprus Museum, acquired a new building in Nicosia in 1990, where its permanent collection of Cypriot artists of the twentieth century is currently on show.

Today art history is not included in the curriculum of the Department of History and Archaeology at the state University of Cyprus (founded in 1989), but courses are occasionally taught by visiting scholars from Greece (Hadjinicolaou among them). It is included in the curriculum of the Department of Multimedia and Graphic Arts at the Cyprus University of Technology (since 2007), but is not offered as a main programme of studies. It is also is taught at the country's Open University in the Studies in Hellenic Civilization programme (since 2006). In addition, art history also appears as a subject in the curricula of the three private universities, recently (2006) approved by the state. The University of Nicosia, the Frederick University and the European University Cyprus offer art history survey courses of Western, Greek and Cypriot art to students of architecture, of art and design, and of applied multimedia. Research topics of concern for Cypriot art historians are mainly focused on Cypriot and Greek artists of the twentieth century.

Cyprus remains divided *de facto* and not *de jure*. In theory, therefore, all discussion of issues pertinent to education in art history borders on illegitimacy. Institutions of higher learning in Northern Cyprus are, as a rule, connected to Turkey; they are termed 'illegal' by the Republic of Cyprus and the United Nations. Art history is taught in two of these institutions, in the Eastern Mediterranean University (where it appears as an autonomous subject in the Department of Archaeology and Art History) and, sporadically, in the Near East University.

Art history is not the epicentre of humanities education in Greece, and it is even more peripheral in Cyprus. Nevertheless, it has acquired enough cultural capital to exercise an appeal in small dosages, as part of the professional training of artists, architects, designers and humanities educators. Many university departments seek to provide their students with a cultural 'lustre' by means of rapid art history survey courses. As an academic orientation, art history is still linked to history and archaeology and

---

[38] On the House of Cyprus see: http://www.spititiskyprou.gr/?page=home (accessed 6 April 2012).

to fine arts departments. Art within national borders continues to be the most attractive subject of research. The traditionally established division of subjects in Greek universities still excludes art historians from examining the art of antiquity, Byzantium and of the Ottoman period. While the grand narratives of Hellenism have declined in academic discourse, they still rule the popular imagination: the opening ceremony of the Olympic Games held in Athens in 2004 underlined this national myth in a spectacular way.

In her outline of art history as an institution Elizabeth Mansfield stated: 'Confidently secular, apologetically commercial, and ambivalently poised between scientific and philosophic aims, art history is a liberal discipline born of modernism.'[39] Greece's individual modernity bore an equally individual genealogy for art history. Paraphrasing the above: confidently independent today, apologetically non-commercial, and ambivalently poised between national concerns and international scientific standards, art history in Greece is a discipline born of a peripheral modernism.

---

[39] Elizabeth Mansfield, 'Art History and Modernism', in *Art History and its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline*, ed. Elizabeth Mansfield (London and New York, 2002) 11.

ART HISTORY IN ITALY: CONNOISSEURSHIP, ACADEMIC SCHOLARSHIP AND THE PROTECTION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE[1]

Laura Iamurri

Connoisseurship and the Protection of Cultural Heritage

The long tradition of art history in Italy developed during centuries of political fragmentation, often marked by foreign domination. The model established by Giorgio Vasari in the sixteenth century, based on artists' lives and largely influential across all Europe, was definitively put aside at the end of the eighteenth century by Luigi Lanzi's *Storia pittorica dell' Italia*. Focusing on regional schools rather than on single artistic personalities, Lanzi set a different model for looking at the close ties between works of art and cultural territories.[2] Historical events, notably the aftermath of the Napoleonic years, deeply affected contexts that had virtually remained unchanged for a long time, producing a puzzling situation marked by a number of works without authors, and authors without works. It is in this intricate web of connections—in which the foundation of major national museums, the new taste for collecting, and the enormous increase of the art market are tightly interlaced—that the crucial development of connoisseurship has to be understood.

Two connoisseurs, well established in the international network of art historians, stand out as major figures in the first years after the unification of Italy (1861): Giovanni Morelli and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle. Morelli, a graduate in medicine who never practised, had been in contact with Karl Friedrich von Rumohr and Gustav Waagen before he met Otto Mündler in Paris, who apparently first introduced him to art connoisseurship.

---

[2] Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, ed. by Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi (Florence, 1966–1987); Luigi Lanzi, *Storia pittorica della Italia dal Risorgimento delle Belle Arti fin presso al fine del XVIII secolo* (1795–96; 1809) ed. Martino Capucci (Florence, 1968). Further notices, and a subtle analysis of the close connections between art history and collecting, in Paola Barocchi, 'Storiografia e collezionismo dal Vasari al Lanzi', *Storia dell'arte italiana* I.2 (Turin, 1979) 6–81.

Cavalcaselle in contrast had been trained as an artist; a campaigner for Italian independence, he was an exile in London, where Charles L. Eastlake appreciated his expertise and where his long partnership with Joseph A. Crowe began.[3]

Cavalcaselle became especially concerned about the conservation and protection of Italy's cultural heritage. In 1862 he wrote a memorandum for the Minister of Education which can be read as an extraordinary outline of cultural politics, taking into account a wide range of problems, from the conservation of 'monumenti e oggetti' ('monuments and objects') to the reform of education.[4] Cavalcaselle continued his studies on Italian art in cooperation with Crowe; in 1864 the *New History of Painting in Italy* was published in London, followed by the *History of Painting in North Italy* (1871) and by the monographs on Titian (1877) and Raphael (1882–85). In 1867 he was appointed inspector at the Museo del Bargello in Florence, and eventually moved to Rome as central inspector at the Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione (Ministry of Education), where he supervised restoration campaigns, advised on museum acquisitions and worked restlessly to promote export laws meant to protect the national patrimony.

As a senator, Morelli was involved in parliamentary commissions charged with enacting restrictive export laws and with setting new standards of conservation practice. His fame as a connoisseur relies on the 'Morellian method', well known for paying special attention to minor details painted by skilled artists in a conventional and scarcely conscious way that he saw as distinctive of each single painter. The results of this 'scientific' connoisseurship appeared first in articles in the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, then in his books on the Italian masters in German and Roman galleries, where Morelli—under the pseudonym of Ivan Lermolieff—discussed a number of previous attributions.[5] Morellian scholarship, through his pupil Gustavo Frizzoni, was crucial in Bernard Berenson's

---

[3] Donata Levi, *Cavalcaselle: Il pioniere della conservazione dell'arte italiana* (Turin, 1988); Anna Chiara Tommasi, ed., *Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle conoscitore e conservatore* (Venice, 1998).

[4] Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle, 'Sulla conservazione dei monumenti i.e. 'Sulla conservazione dei monumenti e degli oggetti di belle arti e sulla riforma dell'insegnamento accademico', *Rivista dei Comuni Italiani* 3.4 (1863) 33–56; 5, 25–43; 6, 33–46, now available at: http://fonti-sa.signum.sns.it (accessed 10 May 2010).

[5] Giovanni Morelli, *Die Werke italienischer Meister in den Galerien i.e. Die Werke italienischer Meister in den Galerien von München, Dresden und Berlin* (Leipzig, 1880); Morelli, *Kunstkritische Studien über italienische Malerei: Die Galerien Borghese und Doria Pamphilj in Rom* (Leipzig, 1890). See Giacomo Agosti, Marisa Dalai Emiliani, Maria Elisabetta Manca, and Matteo Panzeri, eds., *Giovanni Morelli e la cultura dei conoscitori* (Bergamo, 1993). On the 'Morellian method' see Carlo Ginzburg, 'Clues: Roots of an Evidential Method',

education and training. Berenson, who had read the English translation of Morelli's book on Italian masters in the course of his first journey in Europe,[6] was to become one of the most influential voices of international connoisseurship. In Italy, where he had settled in the early 1890s, Berenson became a point of reference long before the late translation (1936) of his *Italian Painters of the Renaissance*.[7] By his legacy to Harvard University, the Villa I Tatti would eventually become a renowned centre for Italian Renaissance studies.

Adolfo Venturi and the Institutional Architecture of Art History

Connoisseurship alone was unable to provide solutions to the problems of the protection of cultural heritage in the young state. Besides, the unification process in art history was delayed for lack of institutions; at the very end of the nineteenth century, the institutional architecture of art history in Italy was still to be built up. Most of this task would be undertaken by Adolfo Venturi; it is no exaggeration to say that he brought about the 'birth' of art history in Italy.[8] Through his work, art history became, at the same time, both a matter of protection of cultural heritage and an academic discipline.

  Scholarly studies on the Galleria Estense in Modena had brought Venturi a certain renown, but when he moved to Rome in 1888 to join the Ministry of Education as an inspector, he was also known for an article which was in fact a sort of manifesto for art history.[9] From that initial article Venturi's overall view was to evolve in subsequent writings into a model expressed by the maxim 'Germania docet', as Venturi put it. This meant an entire project in which the role of museums and galleries had

---

in Ginzburg, *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*, trans. Anne and John Tedeschi (Baltimore, MD, 1989) 96–125.

  [6] Giovanni Morelli, *Italian Masters in German Galleries: A Critical Essay on the Italian Pictures in the Galleries of Munich, Dresden and Berlin*, trans. Louise M. Richter (London, 1883).

  [7] Ernest Samuels, *Bernard Berenson: The Making of a Connoisseur* and *The Making of a Legend* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1979 and 1987). On Berenson's reception in Italy see Bernard Berenson and Roberto Longhi, *Lettere e scartafacci, 1912–1957*, ed. Cesare Garboli and Cristina Montagnani (Milan, 1993); Laura Iamurri, 'Berenson, la pittura moderna e la nuova critica italiana', *Prospettiva* 87–88 (1997) 69–90.

  [8] Giacomo Agosti, *La nascita della storia dell'arte in Italia: Adolfo Venturi dal museo all' università, 1880–1940* (Venice, 1996). Mario D'Onofrio, ed., *Adolfo Venturi e la storia dell'arte oggi* (Modena, 2008).

  [9] Adolfo Venturi, 'Per la storia dell'arte', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 4 (1887) 229–50.

to be strongly supported by academic scholarship, able to train a brand new class of directors, civil servants, and scholars. In 1897 the inauguration of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence, which originated in August Schmarsow's informal seminars, provided a further example, to be compared with the established archaeological institutes in Rome.[10] In addition to long-term projects—which had to face the weakness of the administration and the lack of an academic programme—German art history provided another model, more immediately feasible: the scientific journal as an instrument of real debate. This was soon carried out with the publication in 1888 of *Archivio Storico dell'Arte* (refounded ten years later, in 1898, as *L'Arte*). Along with 'Kunstwissenschaft', duly acknowledged as a major accomplishment, Venturi had in mind the work of Cavalcaselle at the Ministry of Education and the need for the complete cataloguing of works of art within the national borders: an enormous scholarly task, which could supply the basis for any serious attempt to protect the state's national heritage.

In order to regulate the flourishing art market and prevent the flood of exports, the young state needed a law, which was at last passed in 1902. Largely ineffective as it was, the law established nonetheless the system of *soprintendenze*, peripheral bureaus aimed to study and protect the national patrimony scattered throughout the provinces (one of these offices had already been created by Corrado Ricci in Ravenna as early as 1897). It was not until 1909 that the passage of a new law put real restrictions on illegal exports.[11]

In 1901 Venturi began publishing his monumental *Storia dell'arte italiana*, encompassing the history of architecture, painting and sculpture.[12] That very year he was appointed the first professor of art history at the University of Rome; even before his appointment, Venturi had obtained from academic authorities the institution of grants devoted to the Scuola di Perfezionamento, a post-graduate school for art historians meant to prepare skilled and cultivated civil servants that eventually were to join the ranks of the National Galleries. As universities began to establish chairs of art history, some graduates were kept on as full professors. Pietro Toesca

---

[10] Giacomo Agosti, *La nascita della storia dell'arte,* 91–3.

[11] Mario Bencivenni, Riccardo Dalla Negra, and Paola Grifoni, *Monumenti e istituzioni* (Florence, 1987–92).

[12] Adolfo Venturi, *Storia dell'arte italiana*, 25 vols. (Milan, 1901–40).

was appointed at the University of Turin in 1907;[13] when he moved to Florence in 1914, Venturi's son Lionello took his place, after some years in the Galleria Borghese and in the newly founded National Gallery in Urbino.

Virtually all Italian art historians, from the beginning of the century to his retirement in 1931, were students of Adolfo Venturi; the research of young men and women often provided raw material for the *Storia dell'arte italiana* as well as more refined essays and articles to be published in *L'Arte*. Drawing together connoisseurship and philology, Venturi's history of art was shrewd and fascinating from the point of view of method; yet, according to an already well-established tradition, the Cinquecento seemed a limit not to be crossed. It was for the younger Lionello Venturi and Roberto Longhi to draw attention to seventeenth-century painting. Longhi went even further in engaging with modern art, writing on Futurist painting and sculpture as early as 1913.[14] After the First World War, Longhi set aside his interests in the avant-garde and pursued his advocacy of connoisseurship, which eventually would become one of the points that put him at odds with Lionello Venturi; Longhi published ground-breaking books *Piero della Francesca* (1927) and *Officina ferrarese* (1934), along with a series of articles devoted to *caravaggeschi* topics, before being appointed professor at the University of Bologna in 1935.

After studies on Caravaggio in the Galleria Borghese, Lionello Venturi openly called for a renewal of art history in the sense of taking into account modern art (i.e. nineteenth-century French painting). But in fact, he himself was to delay this task until well into the 1920s, when he directed his attention to contemporary painting and eventually succeeded in introducing modern art to as traditional an art-historical journal as *L'Arte*. In 1931 Venturi refused to take the loyalty oath required by the fascist regime of all professors. Dismissed from the university, he moved to Paris and then, in 1939, to New York. During his years in France he worked steadily on the history of art criticism and on modern painting, publishing the first catalogues raisonnés of Cézanne and Pissarro (the latter co-authored with the artist's son), and the key source book *Les Archives de l'Impressionnisme*.[15]

---

[13] See Giovanni Romano, 'Pietro Toesca a Torino' (1996), in Romano, *Storie dell'arte: Toesca, Longhi, Wittkower, Previtali* (Rome, 1998) 1–21.

[14] Roberto Longhi, 'I pittori futuristi', *La Voce* 5.15 (10 April 1913); Longhi, *Scultura futurista Boccioni* (Florence, 1914); both in *Opere complete*, I. *Scritti giovanili* (Florence, 1961) 47–54 and 133–62.

[15] Lionello Venturi, *History of Art Criticism* trans. Charles Marriott (New York, 1936); Venturi, *Paul Cézanne: Son art, son œuvre* (Paris, 1936); Venturi, *Pissarro: Son art, son œuvre* (Paris, 1939); Venturi, *Les archives de l'Impressionnisme* (Paris, 1939).

Between the Wars: National Patrimony Turned into Spectacle

While his pupils found their way into museums and *soprintendenze*, in 1924 Adolfo Venturi was appointed senator. In 1935 his journal *L'Arte*, after editor Anna Maria Brizio repeatedly rejected previous solicitations, was forced to add to the frontispiece the year of the so-called 'Era Fascista' (dating from 1922, with reference to the supposed fascist 'revolution'). Like other totalitarian regimes, Fascism held art in high regard and used it on the international scene both as a tool of diplomatic relations and as a sharp propaganda weapon. Francis Haskell and Emily Braun have shown the political backstage and cultural choices at work in such spectacular events as the *Exhibition of Italian Art, 1200–1900* held at the Royal Academy in London (1930) and the *Exposition d'art italien, de Cimabue à Tiepolo* at the Petit Palais in Paris (1935).[16] These were in keeping with the investment in exhibitions in Italy and in the Venice Biennale, which also had a role in international relations.[17] At the same time a complete reorganization of existing art institutions was put in action, with the establishment in 1931 of the Quadriennale (a national exhibition held every four years in Rome) and the strict regimentation of the artists in *sindacati* (guilds or corporative associations).

As for the protection of the cultural heritage, the work done by Giulio Carlo Argan at the Direzione Generale delle Belle Arti led in 1939 to the establishment of the Istituto Centrale per il Restauro, which had become a leading institution in conservation. Cesare Brandi was appointed as its first director. Experience in the practice and problems both of restoration and conservation, which for obvious reasons increased in the aftermath of war, led Brandi to develop a modern theory of conservation first outlined in papers and lectures, then collected in the book *Teoria del restauro*, published in 1963 and recently translated into many languages.[18]

In 1938, at the request of the Minister of Education, Giuseppe Bottai, a congress of *soprintendenti* was held in Rome with the participation of major art historians including Argan and Longhi. One of the congress'

---

[16] Francis Haskell, *The Ephemeral Museum* (New Haven, CT, and London, 2000) 107–27; Emily Braun, 'Leonardo's Smile', in *Donatello among the Blackshirts: History and Modernity in the Visual Culture of Fascist Italy*, ed. Claudia Lazzaro and Roger J. Crum (Ithaca, NY, and London, 2005) 173–86.

[17] Massimo de Sabbata, *Tra diplomazia e arte: le Biennali di Antonio Maraini, 1928–1942* (Udine, 2006).

[18] Cesare Brandi, *Teoria del restauro* (Rome, 1963). Translations are listed on the website: http://www.cesarebrandi.org/bibliografia/completa_alfabetico_T-U.htm#T (accessed 10 May 2010).

aims was the discussion of the law protecting the national heritage, and its potential improvement. The outcome was to be a good law, which remained in force until 2004. Written by a pool of civil servants with Crocean anti-fascist beliefs, the law was sustained and signed by the Minister: incredibly enough, the same Bottai had held up in 1938 the *Manifesto della razza* (the Italian scientists' statement that overtly backed racist politics) and had warmly supported the implementation in Italian schools of the infamous racial laws which deprived Jews—including of course art historians—of all rights. The 'Bottai law' (as Law 1089 of 1 June 1939 was known) could not prevent either the gifts presented by Mussolini to Hitler or the 'safeguarding' of Italian works of art by German troops during the 1939–45 war. Moreover, as Germany's former ally, Italy was not given priority in the restitution of works found in German repositories and transferred to the Allied Collecting Points.[19] In 1946—at the time of the crucial referendum by which Italy became a Republic—the new Italian Government set up an Ufficio Recuperi ('Office of Restitution') with the objective of reclaiming Italian works of art; Rodolfo Siviero was made its director, thus receiving official acknowledgement of his previous activity in the Italian intelligence service.

History and Modernity: A Double Bind

The autumn of 1945, in the midst of post-war campaigns to restore national treasures, saw the re-opening of universities. Longhi, removed in 1943 by the Fascist government, was reappointed at the University of Bologna in 1945; he moved to the University of Florence in 1949, where he taught until his retirement. Lionello Venturi—back from the USA with the high moral status of the anti-fascist who had refused to serve the regime—was appointed professor at the University of Rome to the chair that had been that of his father. As director of the Scuola di Perfezionamento, he would convey his international experience, which had particularly high value in a country long marked by economic and cultural isolationism. Venturi was also expected to give lectures on modern art; however, Venturi's modernity was bound to a kind of Post-Impressionist legacy, and he never really did become comfortable with the avant-garde that drew his students' interest. As it was, his lessons were attended by young

---

[19] Lynn H. Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York, 1995) 157, 229–72, and 436–9.

artists too, and among Venturi's students Maurizio Calvesi (born 1927) was to become a scholar of modern and contemporary avant-garde.[20] Enrico Crispolti (born 1933), concerned with topics in twentieth-century art, was eventually to be the first to hold a chair of the history of modern art in Italy.[21] The philological grounding given to the history of modern art, as it is demonstrated in Venturi's *Les archives de l'Impressionnisme*, can be found in the important series of publications devoted to modern movements in Italy: *Archivi del Futurismo* (1958–1962), *Archivi dei Sei pittori di Torino* (1965), *Archivi del Divisionismo* (1969) provided documental basis indispensable for further research.[22]

Modern art was a theme to be dealt with. Although Longhi's main interests were in the history of art from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries, from his school there emerged a number of critics and scholars who were deeply involved in modern art criticism (such as Francesco Arcangeli, Giuliano Briganti, Carla Lonzi, Marisa Volpi, to name but a few), or intellectuals who drew on their art history training and used it in different media, as, for instance, Pier Paolo Pasolini and Giovanni Testori. Longhi's tireless insistence on the close connoisseurship of the works of art, along with his talent for finding words to 'tell' the pictures, provided an alternative model for art history; a sketch of his thought is to be found in the landmark article 'Proposte per una critica d'arte', the value of which is not limited to Renaissance and Baroque topics.[23]

A new generation of professors was appointed in the 1950s: Francesco Arcangeli in Bologna, Giulio Carlo Argan in Rome as Venturi's successor, Cesare Brandi in Siena, Anna Maria Brizio in Turin, then in Milan, and Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti in Pisa. Among the new professors, most were deeply interested in contemporary art, in a comprehensive view of art history where, as Brizio put it, 'if one loses sight of the present, even the past

---

[20] See especially Maurizio Calvesi, *Le due avanguardie: Dal futurismo alla pop art* (1966) (Rome and Bari, 1984).

[21] Here 'modern' has to be read as in the current English use; however, in Italian academic periodization, 'modern art' means art dating from the fourteenth to eighteenth century, while nineteenth- and twentieth-century art is the object of the 'storia dell'arte contemporanea'. Crispolti's bibliography is online at www.archiviocrispolti.it (accessed 10 May 2010).

[22] Edited by Maria Drudi Gambillo and Teresa Fiori (Rome, 1958–62); Anna Bovero (Rome, 1965); Teresa Fiori (Rome, 1969) respectively.

[23] Roberto Longhi, 'Proposte per una critica d'arte', *Paragone* 1 (1950) 1 and 5–16. See Giovanni Previtali, ed., *L'arte di scrivere sull'arte: Roberto Longhi nella cultura del nostro tempo* (Rome, 1982).

gets narrower'.[24] Most of them came from either the *soprintendenze* or the museums: they had experienced the idea of art history as a whole system, in which the works and their contexts were—and should remain—tied together.

The attempt to establish a durable relationship between universities, museums and the cultural life of the city could be measured against the history of the Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Moderna in Rome. Palma Bucarelli, head of the museum from 1944 to 1975, organized a series of important exhibitions and successful conferences in partnership with Argan and his pupils. Even in the midst of post-war shortages, Bucarelli was able to assure the public access to recent work by living artists (either well-known artists or young and at their debut), along with exhibitions supported by the international cultural circuit of the Cold War years. Through his loose cooperation with the Galleria, as well as his previous experience in the *soprintendenze*, it became Argan's firm belief that the place of art history departments should be in the museums, so that research could be carried out 'on the spot'.

Argan's rational arguments were applied to a wide range of topics, including European and North American art and architecture.[25] Argan provided a summary of his view of art history in his article 'La storia dell'arte', in which he argued for a renewal of the discipline's intellectual basis by drawing on the actual presence of the art-historical objects and exploring the relationships between artists and political power.[26]

The Renewal of Art History

Different ways of understanding art history and its methods led to a long dispute between Longhi, Venturi, and their followers. The presence of

---

[24] Anna Maria Brizio, as reported by Marisa Dalai Emiliani in Sandra Pinto and Matteo Lafranconi, *Gli storici dell'arte e la peste* (Milan, 2006) 194. Brizio was a scholar mostly of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century art but she has also published the valuable *Ottocento Novecento* (Turin, 1939).

[25] Argan's interest in international topics was pursued by his pupils; see, for instance, Maria Grazia Messina and Jolanda Nigro Covre, *Il cubismo dei cubisti* (Rome, 1986); see also Messina's studies on primitivism and Covre's on the German avant-garde. Orietta Rossi Pinelli, *Arte di frontiera: pittura e identità nazionale nell'Ottocento nord-americano* (Rome, 1996).

[26] Giulio Carlo Argan, 'La storia dell'arte', *Storia dell'arte* I (1969) 1–2 and 5–36. Argan was also the author of a widely influential handbook: *Storia dell'arte italiana*, 4 vols. (Florence, 1968–73).

foreign institutes was another source of constant debate, though hardly ever in the spirit of positive co-operation. These include, alongside the Kunsthistorisches Institut and Villa I Tatti in Florence, the Bibliotheca Hertziana (established in 1913) and the Académie de France in Rome, with its renewed interest in art history. All these institutions, and many others impossible to cite here, brought art historians from different scholarly traditions to Italy; their research, and their often innovative approaches, did not always enjoy a positive reception amongst Italian art historians.

Nonetheless, the 1960s and the 1970s were years of extraordinary renewal in art history in Italy, in terms of both scholarly research and institutional commitment. In 1964 a parliamentary commission headed by the deputy Francesco Franceschini was appointed to undertake an enquiry into the cultural heritage. Its report, published in 1967, led to the establishment of the Ministero dei Beni Culturali, devoted to the protection of cultural heritage, in 1975.[27]

Longhi's concern for the geography of art history, with special regard to the 'minor' centres, came to inform the new thinking of administrative decentralization. Following the institution of the regions as local authorities, Andrea Emiliani supported his proposal for an Istituto per i Beni Culturali of Emilia-Romagna with a ground-breaking essay in which he traced the history of the protection of cultural heritage in Italy; he argued that a model of local protection could be found in Cavalcaselle's memoir *Sulla conservazione*, as opposed to Adolfo Venturi's national stance.[28] At about the same time another former student of Longhi, Bruno Toscano, coordinated a series of studies, later collected as *Ricerche in Umbria*. Enrico Castelnuovo, a student of both Brizio and Longhi, showed a clear preference for the 'borderlands', chiefly around the Alps, and the exchanges between different geographical areas in the Middle Ages. In all these studies (as in many others) the tight relationship between objects, museums, buildings, cities, roads and landscapes posed new questions, to be examined in an expanded way of looking at cultural heritage.

Castelnuovo also had a special role in the renewal of Italian art history as editorial adviser for the publisher Einaudi; this included his involvement in the re-issue of classical studies and/or translations of old and new

---

[27] *Per la salvezza dei beni culturali in Italia: Atti e documenti della Commissione d'indagine per la tutela e la valorizzazione del patrimonio storico, archeologico, artistico e del paesaggio* (Rome, 1967).

[28] See Andrea Emiliani, *Una politica dei beni culturali* (Turin, 1974).

essays, as well as an early interest in the new social history of art.[29] Along with Carlo Dionisotti, Pierre Bourdieu and Francis Haskell, Castelnuovo had also participated in the seminars of the Scuola Normale Superiore (and eventually held the Chair of art history there) since the beginning of the 1980s. At the Scuola, Paola Barocchi had already initiated a new line of research: drawing on her studies on Vasari, Barocchi began to think of artists' lexicons and inaugurated, as early as in the 1970s, a brand new collaboration with computer scientists that led to an inexhaustible exploration of textual recurrences.[30] Tireless philological attention to texts and images led her to the renewed consideration of a wide range of written and visual sources: the former were collected in essential anthologies, which had the potential to rewrite the art history of entire periods, whether neglected or not. Analyses of visual culture proved to be invaluable, as they raised a number of questions about the artists' operative models as well as opening up investigations into the circulation of images in exhibitions, illustrated books and periodicals.[31] Similar directions of research were carried out in the same years by Paolo Fossati, then editor at Einaudi, and by Argan's pupil Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco.[32] The concern for a wider understanding of art history and artists' culture led to the necessary enlargement of the field of studies to include institutions: the market, exhibitions and art history itself.[33] This methodological renewal with its progressive political stance opened the way to new topics, as, for instance, the relevant new concern for art between the wars; far from any ambiguous revisionist aim, Ragghianti's pioneering studies on Italian modernism were soon to

---

[29] See Enrico Castelnuovo, 'Per una storia sociale dell'arte' I (1976) and II (1977)', in Castelnuovo, *Arte, industria, rivoluzioni: Temi di storia sociale dell'arte* (Turin, 1985) 3–64.

[30] See Laura Corti, ed., *CENSUS: Computerization in the History of Art* (Pisa and Los Angeles, 1984).

[31] Barocchi's bibliography on the website of her new project: http://www.memofonte .it/ (accessed 24 August 2010). See, for instance, Barbara Cinelli and Fernando Mazzocca, eds., *Fortuna visiva di Masaccio* (Florence, 1979); Cinelli and Mazzocca, eds., *Artisti e cultura visiva nel Novecento* (Pistoia, 1980); Maria Mimita Lamberti and Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco, eds., *Piero della Francesca e il Novecento, 1920–1938* (Venice, 1991).

[32] Paolo Fossati, '*Valori Plastici*', *1918–1922* (Turin, 1981); Fossati, *La pittura metafisica* (Turin, 1988); see, also, the collection 'Einaudi Letteratura', projected and edited by Fossati and Giulio Bollati, published by Einaudi in the 1970s. As to Fagiolo dell'Arco see especially his innumerable studies on Giorgio de Chirico, and Maurizio Fagiolo, *Realismo magico: pittura e scultura in Italia, 1919–1925* (Milan, 1988).

[33] Maria Mimita Lamberti, '1870–1915: I mutamenti del mercato e le ricerche degli artisti', *Storia dell'arte italiana*, II.3, (Turin, 1982) 5–172. See Donata Levi on *Cavalcaselle*; see also Giacomo Agosti, *La nascita della storia dell'arte*.

be followed by the work of younger scholars.[34] The post-war decades had been marked by a widespread interest in the international avant-garde; the time had come to extend the study of Italian art to the Fascist years, to overlooked artists whose relationships with the Mussolini regime had been far more complicated than the hasty label of 'Fascist art' suggested, and who were not always easy to dismiss as merely compliant artists.[35]

A crucial point in art history in Italy came at the end of the 1970s with the new *Storia dell'arte italiana*, coordinated by Paolo Fossati for the publisher Einaudi, edited by Giovanni Previtali and Federico Zeri. The former, a Giotto scholar who was also interested in attitudes towards medieval art in subsequent centuries, had just founded the journal *Prospettiva*; the latter, a connoisseur without institutional affiliations, had been exploring such neglected forms as Counter-Reformation painting for many years.[36] New issues from contemporary studies in history, archaeology and anthropology provided both the conceptual frame and actual means for redefining the field of art history. Focusing once again on Italian art but gathering not only Italian scholars from *soprintendenze*, museums and universities, the *Storia dell'arte italiana* established a new model of art history. The first volumes, with the comprehensive title *Questioni e metodi*, tackled issues that affected the whole project. This included discussion of institutions, the division into historical periods and the relationships between centres and peripheries, the figure of the artist and the making of art history, the presence of antiquity and iconography, methodological questions and the contacts with foreign art.[37] Subsequent volumes, following a chronological order, presented a whole range of arguments for redefining well-known topics or drawing attention to themes largely neglected by modernist art history such as, to name but one, the enquiries of Sandra Pinto on the

---

[34] Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti, ed., *Arte moderna in Italia, 1915–1935* (Florence, 1967).

[35] See, for instance, Maria Mimita Lamberti and Paolo Fossati, eds., *Felice Casorati: 1883–1963* (Milan, 1985).

[36] See Giovanni Previtali, *La fortuna dei primitivi* (Turin, 1964); Previtali, *Giotto e la sua bottega* (Milan, 1967); Federico Zeri, *Pittura e Controriforma* (Turin, 1957), and the catalogues of the Italian paintings of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

[37] See, in *Storia dell'arte italiana* (Turin, 1979): Giovanni Previtali, 'La periodizzazione dell'arte italiana' I.1, 5–95; Enrico Castelnuovo and Carlo Ginzburg, 'Centro e periferia' I.1, 285–352; Alessandro Conti, 'L'evoluzione dell'artista' I.2, 117–264; Nicole Dacos, 'Arte italiana e arte antica' I.3, 1–68; Salvatore Settis, 'Iconografia dell'arte italiana, 1100–1500: una linea' I.3, 175–270; Ferdinando Bologna, 'I metodi di studio dell'arte italiana e il problema metodologico oggi' I.1, 163–282; Fiorella Sricchia Santoro, 'Arte italiana e arte straniera' I.3, 71–171. See also Salvatore Settis, ed., *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*, 3 vols. (Turin, 1984–86).

Italian nineteenth century.[38] The final volumes drew on topics such as the various histories of images of any kind (illustration, photography, even stamps), conservation practices and problems (restorations, fakes, dispersions), and writings on art; the operative and discursive field of art history was extended, reframed, and discussed.

The Most Recent Decades

The *Storia dell'arte italiana* became a standard point of reference. Nonetheless, one of its contributors, Ferdinando Bologna, marked a subtle distancing from the project when, in 1982, he published the first volume of a new collection entitled *Storia dell'arte in Italia*.[39] The slight shift questioned the use of the adjective 'Italian' for the art produced in the peninsula before 1861. Such a distinction, far from being mere wordplay, was both a consequence of recent studies in art history's geography and an acknowledgment of the history of Italy as a result of different, interwoven, traditions.

Increasing trends towards specialized scholarship put an end to the distinctive broad view discussed above; with a few exceptions, scholars are devoted to more coherently defined, if narrower, fields. As in other countries, this has led to a growing split between art history and contemporary art in terms of competences, working methods, and intellectual frameworks. This trend is unfortunately also at work in the growing distance between universities, *soprintendenze*, and museums, while relations with secondary schools (where the history of art was introduced in the 1920s) have never been really close. Careers are *de facto* more and more separated, at the risk of an impoverishment of the field. The establishment of departments devoted to conservation has somewhat contributed to a diminishing of the humanistic basis of art history, in favour of technical knowledge formerly limited to post-graduate curricula. University research is at risk for lack of funds. Moreover, neo-liberal politics have put in serious danger the protection of cultural heritage; minimal public funding limits maintenance policies and ordinary conservation duties,

---

[38] Sandra Pinto, 'La promozione delle arti negli Stati italiani dall'età delle riforme all'Unità', *Storia dell'arte italiana* II.2, 793–1060.

[39] Ferdinando Bologna, *La coscienza storica dell'arte in Italia*, coll. *Storia dell'arte in Italia* (Turin, 1982).

whereas private sponsorship prefers, with a few exceptions, to finance either spectacular restoration projects or blockbuster exhibitions.[40]

Despite worsening conditions, research continues to be carried out in the various institutions, both with consolidated care for geographic and territorial contexts and an increased attention to exchanges between Italy and other countries. For reasons largely related to the history of the Italian women's movement, coupled with the obvious opposition of the establishment, feminist concerns have long remained outside of academic institutions. However, studies had been carried out first in a loose manner, then—from the 1990s—in a more substantial and resolute way, almost always by individual scholars who rely more on their personal network of relationships than on institutional framing. Twentieth-century women artists, as, for instance, the Futurists, were the first topics to be studied and discussed, along with the celebrated case of Artemisia Gentileschi and other seventeenth-century painters.[41] The history of Italian art endures as a major topic and field of constant exchange of ideas with foreign scholars. While books and essays are mostly published in Italian, they also find a certain circulation among art historians internationally. The same is not always true of studies of modern art: research and, what is more regrettable, primary sources, often remain ignored, to the astonishment of Italian scholars.

The history of conservation practices, collecting, patronage, and institutions, has become part of art history *tout court*, while an interest in renewed monographic studies is worth noting. Recent international interest in artists' visual culture found in Italy an already established field, outlined in the 1980s, which led to a renewed interpretation of images in their social and cultural contexts.

---

[40] For a loose and informal analysis see Pinto and Lafranconi, *Gli storici dell'arte e la peste*.

[41] Laura Iamurri, 'Questions de genre et histoire de l'art en Italie', *Perspective* 4 (2007) 716–21.

ART HISTORY IN THE NETHERLANDS:
THE PAST AND PRESENT OF THE DISCIPLINE

Marga van Mechelen and Kitty Zijlmans

In 2007 the Universities of Utrecht and Leiden celebrated the centennial of the study of art history in the Netherlands. One century before, Willem Vogelsang was appointed as the first professor of art history in Utrecht and Wilhelm Martin as extraordinary professor in Leiden. During the one hundred years in between, academic art history has evolved into a wide field that comprises visual art, design, architecture and archaeology and that extends to universities, fine art academies and post-academic institutions; to the domain of museums, art centres, and presentational institutions; and to organizations geared to the preservation of historical buildings and cultural heritage. Over the years, the size of the field has strongly increased. Furthermore, the earlier mono-disciplinary approach has been more and more replaced with an interdisciplinary orientation. In the last few years, interest in the art (exchanges) of the Netherlands' former colonies and the debate on art and globalization have grown. Related disciplines such as cultural studies, cultural analysis, heritage studies and media studies have enriched the field of art history, while international exchange and collaboration are increasingly pursued. Today's practice of art history has many flavours and colours. This chapter sketches the general outlines of the history of the discipline as it developed in the Netherlands, devoting attention in particular to the significance of seventeenth-century art for Dutch art history, research into De Stijl, the fruitful relation in the Netherlands between architectural history and art history, the innovative turn of the 1970s, and the current state of affairs.

Art History in the Netherlands. Early Beginnings

The actual start of art history as a discipline in the Netherlands is a subject of debate. Some art historians refer back to Carel van Mander, who in 1604 wrote the first documentation of Dutch art, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, or to Arnold Houbraken, who in 1718 published *De Groote Schouburgh der Nederlandsche konstschilders en schilderessen*, a compendium of Dutch artists. Another point of reference is the founding of the chairs of aesthetics and

art history at Dutch universities. The need to appoint these specific chairs dates from 1876 due to the newly adopted Higher Education Act, but it would be another thirty-one years before academic appointments were finally realized with the establishment of the chairs in Utrecht and Leiden in 1907.

When studying the development of art history in the Netherlands it is important to look beyond the universities. Before the establishment of chairs, there was already a tradition in the Netherlands of scholarly art-historical publications, mainly through the efforts of eighteenth-century societies and early nineteenth-century institutes such as Felix Merites and the Amsterdamse Stadsteekenakademie ('Amsterdam Drawing Academy'). In the nineteenth century, lectures on art history were delivered in various places, such as at the Koninklijk Nederlands Instituut, and many of these were published in, for instance, *Kunstkronijk*, a journal set up in 1840. The first professor of art history, C. Lemke, was not appointed at a university but, in 1870, at the Rijksakademie van Beeldende Kunsten ('Royal Academy of Fine Arts') in Amsterdam.[1] In contrast to the archival study and emphasis on connoisseurship that prevailed in the Dutch museum sector around 1900, those in art-historical circles outside of museums and universities mainly had an interest in art criticism and visual perception.

An important incentive for art history's expansion developed within the context of museums and art-historical archives, above all the activities and efforts of two scholars: Abraham Bredius (1855–1946) and Cornelis Hofstede de Groot (1863–1930). Both were pioneers of the systematic study of art and the archiving of art-historical data, in particular, Dutch sixteenth- and seventeenth-century painting. As such they served as founders of the Dutch documentary art-historical apparatus. Bredius, who from 1899 to 1909 was director of the Mauritshuis Museum in The Hague, had no academic training and is best characterized as a connoisseur. His collection of artists' records and archival materials formed the basis of a stream of publications (mainly source material), 300 of which appeared in the renowned Dutch art history magazine *Oud Holland*, founded in 1883. Next to his eight-volume *Künstler-Inventare*, 1915–22, Bredius made valuable contributions to the development of the scholarly museum cata-

---

[1] Lemke, who had a German background, was succeeded by the better known Joseph Albert Alberdingk Thijm (from 1876), who combined stylistic analysis with his own Catholic aesthetics. Jan Six, who in turn succeeded Alberdingk Thijm, was also appointed, in 1906, as lecturer in art history and archaeology at the University of Amsterdam.

logue. His younger colleague, Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, was the first art historian in the Netherlands with a university education (doctoral degree at Leipzig 1891). In 1926, their private archive was donated to the Dutch state and became the foundation of the Netherlands Institute for Art Historical Documentation ('Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, RKD'), which has been open to the public since 1932. To this day, the RKD is one of the largest art-historical institutions of its kind and the largest art history library in the Netherlands. The activities of Bredius and Hofstede de Groot have long been exemplary for the practice of art history in the Netherlands, dominated by the interest in Holland's 'Golden Age', the seventeenth century. They concentrated on the systematic description, attribution and cataloguing of museum holdings, resulting in a plethora of monographic works based on these collections and archives. Another major stimulus for art-historical research was the establishment of the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome in 1903, followed in 1955 by a second institute in Florence. Both institutes have significantly contributed to the production of research into Italian art and classical archaeology by Dutch art historians.

The Founding of National Museums and Heritage Societies

In the context of an emergent sense of Dutch national cultural identity, which, together with the rise of Dutch nationalism, occurred predominantly in the second half of the nineteenth century, museums were founded for the preservation of Dutch art, particularly that of the 'Golden Age'. Strikingly, the Netherlands owes its first museum concerned with storing artistic artefacts to Louis Napoleon, who in 1806 became king of Holland. In 1808, he moved the stadtholder family's art collection to Amsterdam, where it would eventually be housed in the Rijksmuseum, completed in 1885 after a design by P.J.H. Cuypers. The building of the Rijksmuseum was not an isolated case: in the decades around 1900 the number of museums grew rapidly and so did the attention to preserving Dutch cultural heritage. In this respect, a major incentive was given by Victor de Stuers, who, as the all-powerful and rather feared Head of the Department of Arts and Sciences of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (1875–1901), had commissioned the building of the Rijksmuseum.

A major role in inventorying and cataloguing national historical buildings was played by the Royal Dutch Archaeological Society ('Koninklijke Nederlandse Oudheidkundige Bond, KNOB'), founded in 1899, with the

Bulletin van de KNOB as its journal. The KNOB promoted the establishment of first the Bureau, and later, in 1947, the National Institute for the Preservation of Historical Monuments ('Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg'). The concern over the loss and destruction of Dutch art treasures can be seen in the light of an increasing national and historical awareness of the nation's past and its position as a colonial power. Remarkably, this interest did not include the art of the colonies; but for a few exceptions, it was only in the late twentieth century that art historians and art museums started to devote attention to this overlooked part of art history.

   In the search for 'Great Historical Figures', Rembrandt became the national symbol of the great Dutch past, in particular the seventeenth century, and consequently, the concept and ideology of the 'Golden Age' was born. Dutch art and its preservation became government business and this was widely propagated. The effect has been that generations of art historians have predominantly studied Dutch sixteenth- and seventeenth-century art and architecture. Often, this research was performed in close collaboration with Dutch museums and archives, resulting in the establishment of verifiable *catalogues raisonnés* of individual artists on the one hand, and a focus on iconographical research geared towards unveiling hidden moralizing meanings on the other. In the 1960s archival research gained renewed prominence when the Rembrandt Research Project (RRP) was set up with the aim of attributing Rembrandt's paintings to the artist once and for all, by also using scientific research methods. The RRP's attributions are based on an interdisciplinary approach, while a team of experts decides in individual cases.[2]

At the Universities: Consolidation and Innovation

Until recently, methodological innovations—often fostered by insights from abroad—mainly came from the generations of art historians after Vogelsang and Martin, who in 1946 were succeeded by, respectively, Jan Gerrit van Gelder in Utrecht and Henri van de Waal in Leiden. Martin had been a specialist in the field of seventeenth-century Dutch art, a representative of austere, factual, 'exact' art-historical research in the tradition of

---

[2] Equally in-depth research has been conducted regarding the publication and annotation of the letters of Vincent van Gogh. See Leo Jansen, Hans Luijten, Nienke Bakker, eds., *Vincent van Gogh—De brieven: De volledige uitgave* (Amsterdam, 2009). Co-edition: *Vincent van Gogh—The Letters: The Complete Edition*, 6 vols. (London, 2009).

Bredius. Vogelsang had been a convinced proponent of stylistic analysis in the manner of Wölfflin, not only with an eye to Dutch art but also based on interest in international developments and other genres such as sculpture and the applied arts. He viewed iconography (which would flourish from the mid-twentieth century onwards) mainly as an auxiliary discipline. So the practice of art history in the Netherlands prior to the Second World War mainly concentrated on Dutch art from either an archival or a stylistic-analytical perspective. An exception was the Catholic priest and major expert on Christian liturgy, Frederik G.L. van der Meer, who in 1934 earned his PhD on the basis of an iconographical study of the Apocalypse.[3] Later, he became a professor at the Catholic University of Nijmegen, and in this period he published his widely translated 'Atlases' of Christian and Western civilization.

After 1946 a broader and more sustained interest in iconography and iconology developed in the wake of the appointment of the above-mentioned H. van de Waal in Leiden and a series of appointments in Utrecht.[4] Van de Waal developed the well-known classification system Iconclass, which many scholars would later refine and expand. Although Panofsky had received an honorary doctorate at the University of Utrecht as early as 1938, his influence was not immediately noticeable. Iconological study according to Panofsky's method only became a central concern for the generation of art historians such as Josua Bruyn (co-founder of the Rembrandt Research Project), Jan A. Emmens and Edy de Jongh. For them, Panofsky's 'disguised symbolism' served as a starting point for iconological interpretations of Dutch seventeenth-century art. Until the late 1980s, articles on iconographical research were dominant in *Simiolus*, a journal in English set up in 1969. Most Dutch universities undertook iconographical research in the field of medieval art, notably that of the Low Countries. The strong emphasis on interpreting hidden meanings was subsequently replaced by the study of pictorial traditions in connection with cultural-historical, social-cultural and social-economic contexts.[5] Outside Utrecht

---

[3] This study was not based on Panofsky's iconology but was inspired mainly by nineteenth-century iconography.

[4] These included the appointment of Jan Gerrit van Gelder in 1946, Godefridus Johannes Hoogewerff in 1950 and, in 1955, of William S. Heckscher, a student of Panofsky; on Heckscher see Charlotte Schoell-Glass and Elizabeth Sears, *Verzetteln als Methode. Der humanistische Ikonologe William S. Heckscher (1904–1999); Hamburger Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte 6* (Berlin, 2008).

[5] See in particular studies by Eric Jan Sluijter, Christian Tümpel, Reindert Falkenburg and Marten Jan Bok; Bram Kempers's sociology of Italian art, though not directly comparable

and Leiden, Henk W. van Os, professor at the University of Groningen and later director of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, was known for his study of Sienese painting of the late-medieval period.

The 1960s and 1970s also brought changes in architectural history. It managed to move away from the tight embrace of the preservation ethic and began to concentrate on social-economic and cultural-historical approaches. These were developed mainly in departments of architecture at the Polytechnic Schools in Delft and Eindhoven, rather than in conventional art history departments. The journal *Wonen TABK*, the product of a 1973 merger of two older journals geared to housing and interior design (*Wonen*) and construction (*Bouwen*), provides good insight into major developments of this field. In the 1980s the new journal's focus widened towards urban design.[6] In particular the writings of Ed Taverne and Auke van der Woud have contributed to the field's methodological innovation and the broadening of its subject matter. Much research in the Netherlands is also undertaken in applied arts and modern design, formerly mainly in Leiden and now also elsewhere, with special attention to the famed tradition of Dutch typography.[7]

For the advancement of research into more recent art traditions, the establishment of a chair in modern art in 1963 was a milestone. The first *extraordinarius* professor, Hans Jaffé, began his post-war career as curator of the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam. In 1953, he became deputy director under Willem Sandberg (1897–1984) and three years later obtained a doctoral degree with his dissertation *De Stijl 1917–1931: The Dutch Contribution to Modern Art*, which has been of inestimable value for later national and international research on De Stijl. For a long time he was the only professor of modern art. From the 1980s many studies on De Stijl would appear, most notably by Carel Blotkamp, who held the chair in modern art at the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam from 1982 to 2007. A major platform for art historians in the field of contemporary art at that time was *Museumjournaal* (1955–1996), a journal issued by several Dutch modern

---

to the aforementioned studies, should be mentioned also: see Kempers, *Painting, Power and Patronage: the Rise of the Professional Artist in the Italian Renaissance*, trans. Bev Jackson (London, 1992).

[6] It also received a new name, *Archis*, which was published in two languages, English and Dutch. Since 2003 it has been appearing as *Volume*, this time only in English.

[7] Theodor Lunsingh Scheurleer, formerly curator at the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, held the first chair in applied arts in Leiden, succeeded in 1984 by Willemijn Fock. They opened up an entirely new field of research, however, from a theoretical and methodological angle, this field has provided little direct stimulus for renewal.

art museums that published articles by museum curators, art historians, and artists. Although this journal did not publish scholarly articles of sizeable length, it well reflected the field's changing views.[8] In 1984 a more independent, new journal, *Jong Holland*, was founded that served as a platform for scholarly articles by (if possible) young art historians on subjects mainly related to Dutch Art.

The Popularization of Art History

The journals mentioned so far were—or are—largely geared towards an audience of those with a professional interest in art. In addition, there has always been a wide selection of Dutch art journals that cater to a larger audience. Many art historians have actively pursued these more general platforms, which also included journals such as *Heemschut* and *Palet*, as well as overviews of Dutch art history and, later, specific television programmes, sometimes linked to a printed periodical. One example is *Openbaar Kunstbezit*, a TV programme that was initially accompanied by a loose-leaf journal that gave countless viewers a better understanding of art and also made them more interested in it. The AVRO programme *Kunstgrepen* owed its popularity to its presenter Pierre Janssen. Between 1959 and 1972 there have been some one hundred broadcasts of this extremely popular series. Likewise, another AVRO series, *Beeldenstorm*, hosted by Henk van Os and broadcast from 1996, has reached an equally large audience. Both presenters also served a good part of their career as museum directors, whereby they put much effort into lowering the threshold of museums. More art historians have chosen the art exhibition as a way of presenting their research and specific subjects, as, for example, the Vermeer expert Albert Blankert in his exhibition of 'Caravaggists' and 'Italianisanten' (seventeenth-century Northern European landscape painters who travelled to Italy). Meanwhile, the number of popular art magazines has increased and magazines such as *Kunstbeeld, Items, Kunst & Antiekjournaal (Collect), Kunstschrift, Museumvisie*, and *Tableau* have healthy numbers of subscribers.

---

[8] See the dissertation by Rogier Schumacher, *Museumjournaal en de ontvangst van de neo-avant-garde in Nederland 1961–1973* (PhD Dissertation, University of Utrecht, 2007).

The 1970s and 1980s: The Shifting Object of Art History

The high point of the public popularity of iconographical research, as reflected by the 1976 exhibition *Tot Lering en Vermaak* ('For Learning and Pleasure') at the same time marked the start of the decline of iconography/ iconology as the most current art-historical approach. Around the mid-1970s, the first signals could be noted of what later would be called the 'new art history'. Issues such as authorship—the 'death of the author' followed by the 'birth of the viewer'—as well as (social) context and ideological factors were increasingly explored. While iconographical inquiry prevailed at all Dutch universities, at first these new signals could be observed only in two or three places: the Polytechnic School in Delft and the University of Amsterdam, soon followed by the Catholic University of Nijmegen. In the 1970s the pressure to renew art history mainly came from students, notably in Amsterdam and Nijmegen. From that time, the mutual inspiration of architectural theory and art history of the modern period has defined the further development of the 'new' art history. This is hardly surprising, given the Dutch tradition of including the study of architectural history and theory within art history programmes.

In the 1970s students of modern art history were initially oriented mainly towards theoretical developments in England and Germany. Timothy Clark, through his contacts with the leftist movement in France and his new approach to social art history, set an important example. Another influence of note was the Ulmer Verein, an alliance of leftist-critical scholars of art and culture set up in Germany in 1968. Their first publications appeared in 1973 and they were soon much read and debated in the Netherlands. Partly influenced by the publications of the SUN (Socialistische Uitgeverij Nijmegen), students in Nijmegen were also geared to neo-Marxist and poststructuralist debate in France and Italy.[9] This led to a memorable conference in 1978, occasioned by the publication of the Dutch translation of Nicos Hadjinicolaou's *Art History and Class Struggle*, a practical elaboration of the Marxist art-historical method of the

---

9 The SUN in Nijmegen and the SUA in Amsterdam, publisher of *De Kunstreeks*, were both initially geared to the reconstruction of Marxism as theory. In 1990, the SUN became the publisher of *OASE*, an architectural periodical of design, research and education, which had started as a student publication in 1981 at the faculty of Architecture of the Delft University of Technology, in collaboration with other architecture departments at universities and art schools. The first publication in *De Kunstreeks*, in 1984, was the dissertation of Frank Reijnders, who was the first of the new generation to consider the discipline's history, as well as theory and methodology, from a critical position.

Hungarian art historian Frederick Antal, based on Louis Althusser's theory of ideology.[10] The conference was dominated, however, by architectural historians, who had also set the tone two years before at the symposium *Architectural History. A Social Science?*[11]

While interest in Althusserian art history seemed to have dwindled among the organizers and participants of the Nijmegen conference—they had already shifted their gaze more towards Foucault and the Venetian School (Tafuri, Dal Co, Cacciari)—the appearance of the book by Hadjinicolaou caused quite a stir in the wider circle of Dutch art historians. Over the next decade and a half, two other publications would have a similar effect: *The Art of Describing. Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (1983) by Svetlana Alpers and *Reading Rembrandt* (1991) by the literary theorist Mieke Bal. Both studies challenged major views of a firmly established tradition in art history; seventeenth-century Dutch art, and both were hotly debated and contested among art historians of the early modern period. Meanwhile most scholars of modern and contemporary art and historians of architecture continued to employ various approaches, covered by the notion of 'new art history'.[12]

In the course of the 1980s the direct influence of new developments from Germany, France and Italy gradually grew weaker. This had a 'practical' reason rather than an intrinsic one: the reduced skills of students when it came to reading texts in Italian, French and German. Other relevant factors pertained to cuts in the duration of degree programmes and the overall broadening of the scope in art history. Interest in French thinkers like Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Julia Kristeva and Jean Baudrillard continued to be substantial, though, also because of their reception in the United States—and, to a lesser degree, England—where their work was widely translated and published in anthologies, and where neo-Marxist,

---

[10] In Dutch translation as *Kunstgeschiedenis en Ideologie* (Art History and Ideology) (Nijmegen, 1978). It was translated by Piet Berkers and Pieter Jan Gijsberts, organizers of the conference.

[11] Most notably Michael Müller and Francesco dal Co, as well as Jan de Heer and Kees Vollemans, who were both teaching at the Polytechnic School in Delft.

[12] Many dissertations would follow the one of Frank Reijnders that represent the New Art History, including those of Marlite Halbertsma (on Wilhelm Pinder), Marga van Mechelen (on semiotics), Debora Meijers (on conceptions of display in museums), Mirjam van Rijsingen (on gender) and Kitty Zijlmans (art history and systems theory). To this day most of them, who all have their roots in the critical 1970s and the New Art History, teach in one of the Dutch academic art history curriculums, notably in Amsterdam but also in Leiden, Rotterdam and Nijmegen.

feminist, semiotic, structuralist and post-structuralist approaches in art history gained ground.

In the area of the study of Dutch art in the ('long') seventeenth century (1566–1700) a number of things changed as well. More attention was paid to the role of social class, ideology, national identity and gender in the art history concerned with that period. This change was also reflected by international scholarship, most notably Svetlana Alpers's *The Art of Describing* and Simon Schama's *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (1987, translated into Dutch the following year).[13] One reason for the negative assessment and the rather limited influence of these scholars on art-historical practice in the Netherlands is the undervaluation of the exceptionality of seventeenth-century art and of older Dutch art historiography on that period. Among Dutch scholars of the post-war era, there has long been a fear of 'nineteenth-century' glorification, an attitude at odds with that among foreign experts. The renewal of the study of seventeenth-century art followed only after art historians such as Wilhelm Martin were read again and, as a consequence, a positive interest emerged in artistic training in the seventeenth century, in studio practices, buyers of art, the art market, art collecting and contemporary response. This development is reflected in the more recent research of Marten Jan Bok. Next to the re-evaluation of Martin's work, Abraham Bredius' archival studies gained renewed interest. In the 1990s publications of John Michael Montias, such as those on Johannes Vermeer and Rembrandt, became influential in particular.[14] Together with current results from social-economic research by economists and historians, this has provided a major stimulus for current, interdisciplinary art-historical research. The *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* ('Netherlands Art History Yearbook', since 1947) provides a good insight into the topicality of subjects.

By far the largest research project in the 1970s and 1980s in the field of early modern studies was the Rembrandt Research Project. The publication of the third volume of *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings* in 1989 marked the end of an era, and under the supervision of Ernst van de Wetering the RRP entered a new phase. This was characterized on the one hand by

---

[13] Their influence on the younger generation of Dutch art historians would eventually remain limited, however. The same applies for the studies of Mieke Bal, written from a semiotic, psychoanalytical and gender-theoretical perspective—approaches practiced fairly little by Dutch art historians of the early-modern era.

[14] The first publications of John Michael Montias appeared in the late 1970s in *Simiolus*.

more public debate on the attribution of works to Rembrandt and the involvement of expertise and opinions from outside the RRP. On the other hand, the 'Rembrandt story' now clearly bears the stamp of Ernst van de Wetering, as the forth volume of the *Corpus*, published in 2005, shows.

Art History in the Netherlands Today

A tour of institutions, where, at the start of the twenty-first century, art history is taught, will include six universities with graduate and undergraduate programmes in art history,[15] as well as a similar number of related programmes in cultural studies, cultural analysis, museum studies and media studies. Each year hundreds of students enter graduate and undergraduate programmes. We also find art history in the Bachelor and Master programmes at the Schools of Art (both art academies and 'Hogescholen voor de Kunsten'), and in the three post-academic institutes in the Netherlands.[16]

As to the organization of the research, much has changed in the past twenty-five years. Many, mostly multidisciplinary, (post)graduate schools and research institutions have been set up, whereby the first operate nationally or internationally and the second locally, meaning that they are linked to one specific university, faculty or research institute. The three main research facilities for art historians are the Postgraduate School for Art History (Onderzoekschool Kunstgeschiedenis), the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA) and the Huizinga Institute (Graduate School for Cultural History). Moreover, several art museums, such as the Van Gogh Museum and the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam play a role in art-historical research that stretches beyond issuing collection or exhibition catalogues. Major spawning grounds for reflection on contemporary art are several internationally oriented arts centres such as De Appel in Amsterdam, BAK (Basis voor Actuele Kunst) in Utrecht and Witte de With in Rotterdam. In addition, the Netherlands has a number of art magazines of which currently *Metropolis M* seems to link up with debates conducted in the academic world. *Jong Holland* that existed from 1984–2006 has

---

[15] University of Amsterdam, Free University Amsterdam, Leiden University, Utrecht University, State University of Groningen, Radboud University Nijmegen, as well as Open University Heerlen and the Polytechnic Schools, now universities, in Delft and Eindhoven.

[16] The Jan van Eyck Academy in Maastricht, the Rijksakademie in Amsterdam, and De Ateliers in Amsterdam.

already been mentioned. A final major publication is the Belgian art journal in newspaper format, *De Witte Raaf*, in which Dutch art historians and critics publish and which is also funded in part by the Dutch government through the Mondrian Foundation. For nearly a decade NWO/Humanities (the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research) has been sponsoring thematic research programmes in the field of the arts and culture, and it is the explicit intention to move beyond the boundaries of the disciplines.[17] They promote interdisciplinary research and, more than before, they place emphasis on what is regarded in contemporary art and culture as current concerns.

In the last decade, heritage preservation has increasingly become a central focal point.[18] The RCE (Cultural Heritage Agency), a section of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, came into being in 2011 after a merger of several institutions; its task is to improve the quality of management and conservation of Dutch cultural heritage. In the area of heritage studies it is also important to note innovations in archaeological research. In archaeology the integration of heritage approaches and cultural historical approaches and Dutch archaeology, which has always been embedded more in the social and natural sciences, has proven to be very productive, not only because of the cross-fertilization between these disciplines, but also because it has stimulated reflection on other approaches (inspired by Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu, Bruno Latour and others).

A last recent trend in research is the development of a PhD in the creative arts, in close interaction with the realization of MA programmes in artistic research, which seeks to form a bridge between art and standard scholarly research by offering insight into and training in new forms of research. The PhD in the creative arts involves a specific format, as it comprises not only an artistic component, but also a related discursive-reflective part. Through establishing lectureships in institutions of higher

---

[17] Examples include the interdisciplinary research programmes *Transformations in Art and Culture* and *The Future of the Religious Past*, and for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries *Artistic and Economic Competition in the Amsterdam Art Market c. 1630–1690; The Impact of Oil, Cultural Transmission and Artistic Exchange in the Low Countries 1577–1672: Mobility of Artists, Works of Art and Artistic Knowledge.*

[18] In this area the Cultural Heritage Agency (Rijksdienst voor Cultureel Erfgoed, RCE) and the Netherlands Institute for Art History (Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, RKD) are active.

education, amongst them schools of art since 2001, the government has tried to connect education, practice and applied research. Both initiatives seem to be a logical effect of this effort.[19]

Despite attempts on the part of the government to stimulate art museums to pay more attention to art of the former Dutch colonies, such efforts were until recently not very successful. The activities of the Gate Foundation, set up in 1988 in Amsterdam (and government funded until 2006) to promote intercultural exchange between the Western and non-Western world, have improved this situation.[20] Furthermore, as author and curator, Adi Martis—former lecturer at Utrecht University who has Aruban roots—has managed to raise attention for art in this region.[21] In addition, the Dutch government has put in efforts aimed at preserving the cultural heritage of the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. With respect to attention for art in Indonesia, another important former colony of the Netherlands, the situation has hardly been better. In 1998 the first dissertation on modern Indonesian art appeared, after earlier, in 1988, another dissertation examined art education in Indonesia.[22] In today's academic and museum circles, however, the interest for global art is gradually increasing.[23]

As in many other places, art history in the Netherlands developed from a mono-disciplinary, archive-based discipline into a multidisciplinary field

---

[19] A lectureship is led by a lecturer (referred to as professor elsewhere) and on average comprises ten instructor-researchers and external experts. Lectureships engage in collaborative efforts with businesses and institutions at a local, regional, national and international level.

[20] From 1988 to 1996 Els van der Plas served as the Gate Foundation's first director, and to this day she is director of the Prince Claus Fund, a platform for intercultural exchange. This Fund's activities and publications are realized in cooperation with individuals and organizations in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean.

[21] See Adi Martis and Jennifer Smit, *Arte, Dutch Caribbean Art. Beeldende kunst van de Nederlandse Antillen en Aruba* (Amsterdam, 2002). For many years the Dutch anthropological museums, notably the Tropen Museum/Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam, have been promoting debate on the integration of Western and non-Western art. See Harrie Leyten and Bibi Damen, eds., *Art, Anthropology and the Modes of Re-presentation: Museums and Contemporary Non-Western Art* (Amsterdam, 1993); Chandra Van Binnendijk and Paul Faber, *Beeldende kunst in Suriname: De twintigste eeuw* (Amsterdam, 2000).

[22] Helena Spanjaard, *Het ideaal van een moderne Indonesische schilderkunst 1900–1995: De creatie van een nationale culturele identiteit* (Unpublished Dissertation, University of Leiden, 1998); Herbert van Rheeden, *Om de vorm: Een eeuw teken-, handenarbeid- en kunstnijverheidsonderwijs in Nederland* (Unpublished Dissertation, University of Amsterdam, 1988).

[23] An increasing number of debates and symposia are being organized in universities, museums and art venues to discuss art (history) in a globalizing world. See also Wilfried van Damme and Kitty Zijlmans, 'Art History in a Global Frame: World Art Studies', 217–229 in this volume.

of expertise, engaged in the study of art, design, and architecture of both past and present, and in theory and methodology. The emphasis on the art of the Western world, and in our case the Netherlands, has also given way to a more global awareness. Art history in the Netherlands is concerned with a wealth of cultural heritage that needs to be preserved, interpreted and presented, and there is vibrant activity in the area of art, design and architecture that needs to be followed critically and translated for wider audiences, as interest for these areas in society at large is increasing. A sustainable art history will be more and more geared towards reflection on what role the discipline can play in the changing society of the twenty-first century. It is certainly something the Dutch authorities, as well as the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, are seeking.

ART HISTORY IN THE NORDIC COUNTRIES[1]

Dan Karlholm, Hans Dam Christensen and Matthew Rampley

The core of Scandinavia as a label is linguistic, pointing to the close connections between the so-called Scandinavian languages: Danish, Norwegian and Swedish. The inhabitants of these Nordic countries can communicate with each other using their mother-tongue. The geographical and cultural region of Scandinavia was known already to Pliny the Elder, and was from the eighteenth century a matter of fluctuating political attention. Students, especially, formed Scandinavian associations in the mid-nineteenth century, pressing their governments to strengthen the cultural bonds and strive to unify the peoples of the north. The movement, known as 'Scandinavianism', survived into the twentieth century.[2] Today, however, the label is increasingly and preferably replaced by the neutral alternative the 'Nordic countries', which also includes Finland, with its Finno-Ugric linguistic roots, and Iceland. In English, however, 'Scandinavia' remains the most frequent label.

All of the four countries under consideration in the present chapter are united by a number of factors when it comes to their history of art history and visual studies. While, in the last two decades, English has become the standard language of communication in inter-Nordic scholarly exchange, most of them developed important departments devoted to aesthetics and the arts on the basis of German models in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In Denmark art history was officially established at the University of Copenhagen in 1856, when the elderly Niels Laurits Høyen (1798–1870) was appointed professor of art history. In the years prior to his employment, students were able to attend lectures in aesthetics which, from time to time, included the history of art. Høyen had been vigorously involved in the development of a modern art institution outside the setting of the university for several decades. As a young man he spent a period of three years visiting European art collections and libraries. After

---

[1] Thanks are due to Johanna Vakkari and Susanna Pettersson for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

[2] See, for example, Lorenz Rerup, 'Fra litterær til politisk nationalism: Udvikling og udbredelse fra 1808 til 1845', in *Dansk identitetshistorie*, 2, ed. Ole Feldbæk (Copenhagen, 1991) 325–90.

returning to Copenhagen in 1825, he soon became professor of Nordic and Greek mythology at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts; since the position included art history, the professorial title was renamed to that of history of art. Alongside his work as a teacher and scholar of art history, he was a leading art critic and curator.[3]

After his death in 1870, Høyen was succeeded by Julius Lange (1838–1896), who was, however, appointed extraordinary lecturer and then extraordinary professor. As elsewhere during these founding years of art history in Scandinavia, this was a personal chair, restricted to Lange.[4] A scholar with wide-ranging interests, Lange published research on a variety of topics ranging from Danish artists such as Thorvaldsen, to Michelangelo, Egyptian and Assyrian art.[5] In *Om Kunstværdi* ('On Artistic Value') published in 1876, he offered an influential outline of the role of aesthetic reception, which also involved a discussion of Hippolyte Taine. Although Lange agreed with Taine's methodical approach to the topic of the work of art, he thought that Taine seemed to forget the subjective relation, that is, the artist's perception of the topic represented and his capability to transfer this to the spectator. Lange's major scholarly work was his studies of the human form in the history of art.[6]

The development of art history in Norway occurred at approximately the same time; the first institution was the Royal Frederik's University of Christiania (from 1939 named the University of Oslo), which founded a chair of art history in 1875; Lorentz Dietrichson (1834–1917), a close colleague of Julius Lange, was appointed the first extraordinary professor. Championing a notion of art history as a positivistic science—he frequently also referred to Hippolyte Taine—based on inductive scholarship,

---

[3] Else Kai Sass, 'Kunsthistorie', in Povl Johs Jensen, ed., *Københavns Universitet 1479–1979*, 9, ed. Povl Johs Jensen (Copenhagen, 1979) 246–63.

[4] Hans Dam Christensen, *Forskydningens kunst: Kritiske bidrag til kunsthistoriens historie* (Copenhagen, 2001) 8–16.

[5] See for example Julius Lange, *Michelangelo og Marmoret* (Copenhagen, 1871); Lange, *Thorwaldsen's Darstellung des Menschen* (Berlin, 1894); Lange, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 2 vols. (Strasbourg, 1911–12). On Lange see Marianne Marcussen, 'The Danish Art Historian Julius Lange: His Attitude to Trends in Art History in Europe and his Collaboration with Scandinavian Colleagues', in *Towards a Science of Art History. J.J. Tikkanen and Art-historical Scholarship in Europe*, ed. Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2009) 71–84.

[6] Julius Lange, *Om Kunstværdi* (Copenhagen, 1876; in German: *Vom Kunstwert: Zwei Vorträge*, Zurich, 1925); Lange, *Billedkunstens Fremstilling af Menneskeskikkelsen i dens ældste Periode indtil Højdepunktet af den græske Kunst* (Copenhagen, 1892) and *Menneskefiguren i Kunstens Historie: Fra den græske Kunsts anden Blomstringstid indtil vort Aarhundrede* (Copenhagen, 1898; in German: *Die menschliche Gestalt in der Geschichte der Kunst von der zweiten Blütezeit der griechischen Kunst bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*, Strasbourg, 1903).

Dietrichson played a central role in legitimizing the discipline in Norway.[7] This was also linked to an ideologically motivated championing of Norwegian national identity; he authored an unpublished history of Norwegian art that formed the basis of much of his teaching.[8] The development of the profession of art history received a boost in 1904, when the Norwegian Art History Association ('Kunsthistorisk forening') was founded, upon the initiative of Dietrichson, who was also founding editor of the journal *Kunst og Kultur* ('Art and Culture') in 1909; both the Association and the journal, which is regarded as the main Norwegian journal for visual art, architecture and craft, have continued up to the present.[9] When Dietrichson retired in 1916, his position was vacant until 1920, when it became a full professorship. Carl W. Schnitler held the position until his death, after which it was vacant once more during the period 1926–36.[10] The number of qualified candidates was still limited.

Art history emerged in Finland at approximately the same time. A Finnish Art Society was founded in 1846; it began organizing art exhibitions in the same year, and in 1848 a drawing school was set up. The Society established an art collection in 1868; initially funded purely by membership subscription fees, the Society gained state support for the drawing school from 1863 onwards. The first professor of aesthetics and modern literature, based at the University of Helsinki (officially known as the Imperial Alexander University, since Finland was still part of Russia) from 1854 until 1867, was Fredrik Cygnaeus (1807–1881).[11] Cygnaeus restricted himself to lecturing on aesthetics, however, and hence it was his successor, Carl Gustaf Estlander (1834–1910), who was the first to hold lectures in art history at the beginning of the 1860s. These lectures provided the basis for Estlander's book *De bildande konsternas historia från*

---

[7] A scholar of both literature and art, Lorentz Dietrichson's publications included *Det Skönas Verld: Estetikens och Konsthistoriens Hufvudläror* (Stockholm, 1860–70); Dietrichson, *Antinoos, eine kunstarchäologische Untersuchung* (Oslo and Christiana, 1884); Dietrichson, *Christusbilledet* (Copenhagen, 1880).

[8] On Dietrichson's history of Norwegian art see Mai Britt Guleng, 'Lorentz Dietrichson and the Making of Norwegian Art History', in Vakkari, ed., *Towards a Science of Art History*, 59–70.

[9] Mai Britt Guleng, 'Kunsthistorisk forening og kunsthistoriefagets betingelser', *Kunst og Kultur* 3 (2004).

[10] Mai Britt Guleng, *Kunsten og Videnskaberne: Kunsthistorie ved Det Kgl: Frederiks Universitet inntil 1875* (Oslo, 1999).

[11] On Cygnaeus see Susanna Pettersson, 'For the People's Best: Frederik Cygnaeus and the Course taken by Art in Finland', in *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, ed. Renja Suominen-Kokkonen and Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2007) 11–24.

slutet av adertonde århundradet till våra dagar ('The History of Art from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present Day'), published in 1867, which offered a general overview of the currents of art history. In 1876, he founded the scholarly and scientific journal *Finsk Tidskrift* ('Journal of Finland') and he was also one of the founders of the country's leading liberal Swedish-language newspaper, *Helsingfors Dagblad*.[12] The fact that these publications were in Swedish indicates its hegemonic position in late nineteenth-century Finland; the educated class was mostly Swedish-speaking. Swedish was the language of scholarship and, until 1902, the official language of instruction at the University. Indeed, Estlander founded the Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland ('The Swedish Literary Society in Finland') in 1885, which was devoted to promoting Swedish-language literature, and distanced himself from the movement for the recognition of Finnish.

Estlander's most enduring achievement, perhaps, was as the founder of the Ateneum, the Neo-Renaissance museum that would eventually become the Finnish National Gallery when the latter was instituted in 1990.[13] Built in 1887 and opened to the public in 1888, the Ateneum initially housed the collection of both the Finnish Art Society, of which Estlander was Chair, and also the Finnish Society for Arts and Crafts, founded in 1875. It also accommodated their schools. It was Estlander's vision that the Ateneum should bring fine art and the arts and crafts together, although later, in the 1920s, the arts and crafts collection was moved elsewhere due to a shortage of space, while the school of arts and crafts continued to be based there until 1984.

The other major figure in the early history of the discipline in Finland was Johan Tikkanen (1857–1930). Tikkanen, who studied with Estlander and graduated as candidate in philosophy (Master of Arts) in 1880, was appointed as an extraordinary professor of art history in Helsinki in 1897. Alongside his academic studies, Tikkanen was also trained as an artist, which was of great importance for his research, guiding his choices and

---

[12] On Estlander see Eva Maijo Viljo, 'Carl Gustav Estlander and the Beginning of Studies of the Visual Arts at the University of Helsinki', in Suominen-Kokkonen and Vakkari, eds., *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, 25–39. On the early history of art history in Finland see Susanna Pettersson, *Suomen Taideyhdistyksestä Ateneumiin: Fredrik Cygnaeus, Carl Gustaf Estlander ja taidekokoelman roolit* (Helsinki, 2008).

[13] The Finnish national gallery was formed in 1990 when a number of collections, including that of the Finnish Art Society, were handed over to the state. It comprises four departments: the Ateneum Art Museum, the Sinebrychoff Art Museum, the Museum of Contemporary Art (Kiasma) and the Central Art Archives.

influencing his methods. In particular, Tikkanen also made a significant contribution to the Finnish art world of his day by writing art criticism and reviews for newspapers, publishing books and scholarly articles on contemporary art in Finland, and above all through 35 years of service with the Finnish Art Society, first as its secretary and finally as its chairman. He also founded the Central Art Archives in 1897. Like Estlander, he was Swedish-speaking; indeed, it is thought that he adapted with difficulty to the introduction of Finnish as the main language of university teaching in the early 1900s.[14]

Although now little known outside of Finland and Germany, he was one of the leading European scholars shaping art history into an independent discipline, with an international reputation comparable to that of Heinrich Wölfflin or Alois Riegl, and maintained warm relations with a number of scholars abroad, including Adolfo Venturi.[15] Tikkanen was a scholar of Italian art; having completed his doctoral dissertation on Giotto in 1884 he went on to publish widely on medieval and Renaissance art.[16] Among his early doctoral candidates, Osvald Sirén (1879–1966) and Tancred Borenius (1885–1948) went on to successful international careers; Sirén was appointed professor of art history at the University of Stockholm in 1908 while Borenius became the first professor of art history at the Slade School of Art in London in 1922.[17] Within Finland, Onni Okkonen (1886–1962) became Tikkanen's successor as professor of art history at the University of Helsinki.

In Sweden the very first professorship, made possible through a private donation, was established not at a university but at the Stockholm högskola (University College) in 1889. The first university chair was established in Uppsala (1917), followed by Lund (1919). In 1920, two additional chairs were established at Stockholm and Göteborg högskola respectively.

---

14 See Johanna Vakkari, 'J.J. Tikkanen and the Teaching of Art History', in Suominen-Kokkonen and Vakkari, eds., *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, 69–83.

15 On the relation between Tikkanen and Venturi see Gianni Carlo Sciolla, 'J.J. Tikkanen and the Origins of 'Kunstwissenschaft' in Italy', in Vakkari, ed., *Towards a Science of Art History*, 95–102.

16 Tikkanen's doctoral dissertation was published as *Der malerische Styl Giotto's: Versuch zu einer Charakteristik desselben* (Helsinki, 1884). Other major publications included the multi-volume *Die Psalterillustration im Mittelalter* (Helsinki, 1895–1900). See Johanna Vakkari, *Focus on Form: J.J. Tikkanen, Giotto and Art Research in the 19th Century* (Helsinki, 2007).

17 On Borenius see Johanna Lindfors, 'Tancred Borenius: Our Man in England', in Suominen-Kokkonen and Vakkari, eds., *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, 169–80.

All of these were established by the state.[18] In sum, these five professorships were to dominate the academic field of art history in Sweden until two more were established in the late 1970s, when university reform (1969) allowed for many more students to enter academia.[19]

From these beginnings the growth of institutionalized art history proceeded slowly. From Julius Lange's death in 1896 until the early 1930s, the art history chair at the University of Copenhagen was not a full professorship and was at times vacant. Research in art history blossomed instead at the emerging art museums and the Royal Academy of Fine Arts. In particular, Vilhelm Wanscher (1875–1961), professor in the history of architecture, a sceptical pupil of Lange and, during his stay in Berlin 1898–99, of Adolph Goldschmidt, should be mentioned for his influential criticism and his efforts as editor of the prestigious international art-historical year book *Artes. Monuments et mémoires publiés sous la direction de Wilhelm Wanscher* (1932–1940).[20]

Eventually, Christian Elling (1901–1974) was appointed extraordinary lecturer in art history at the University of Copenhagen in 1932 and, in 1939, he acquired a full professorship. In the intervening time, Elling built up the Department of Art History with its own library and slide collection.[21] Yet an apparatus of art-historical study already existed before this point. From the mid-1860s onwards the library at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts had systematically collected literature on the history of the visual arts, and today, this collection is by far the largest Danish library of art-historical literature.[22] In Sweden the institutionalization of art history as a scholarly discourse was confirmed by the establishment of the Society of Art Historians in 1914, and by the publication, from 1932 onwards, of the *Konsthistorisk tidskrift* ('Journal of Art History'), the one international academic

---

[18] Hans Pettersson, 'Konsthistoria som universitetsdisciplin', in *8 kapitel om konsthistoriens historia i Sverige*, ed. Britt-Inger Johansson and Hans Pettersson (Stockholm, 2000) 63–91.

[19] Anders Åman, 'Före och efter 1970—från konsthistoria till konstvetenskap', in Johansson and Pettersson, eds., *8 kapitel*, 204–20.

[20] Hans Dam Christensen, *Forskydningens kunst* 8–16; Eva Friis, 'Et opgør med Julius Lange: Kunsthistorikeren Vilhelm Wanschers æstetiske kunstopfattelse', in *Viljen til det menneskelige. Tekster omkring Julius Lange*, ed. Hans Dam Christensen, Hanne Kolind Poulsen and Peter Nørgaard Larsen (Copenhagen, 1999) 233–56.

[21] See Christian Elling, *Holmes bygningshistorie: 1680–1930* (Copenhagen, 1932); Elling, *Det klassiske København: en byaestetisk studie* (Copenhagen, 1944); Elling, *Rom: Arkitekturens liv fra Bernini til Thorvaldsen* (Copenhagen, 1956). Published in English as *Rome: The Biography of Its Architecture from Bernini to Thorvaldsen*, trans. Bob and Inge Gosney (Colorado, 1975).

[22] Else Kai Sass, 'Kunsthistorie', 309–17.

journal of art history in the Nordic countries which was traditionally connected to the professorial chair of art history in Stockholm.[23]

At Åbo Akademi University, the Swedish-speaking university in Finland, lectures in art history were given from 1903, which helped realize the founding of the academy in 1918. A professorship, privately funded, was installed the following year, and was held by the Austrian art historian Josef Strzygowski until 1925. The department for art history has ever since had a distinctly international character. The name of the department was changed in 1943 to 'Konsthistoria med konstteori' (Art history with art theory), and was changed again in 1993 to 'Konstvetenskap' (the 'scientific study of art' on the model of German 'Kunstwissenschaft'). All lectures here, from traditional art history to visual studies, are in Swedish.[24]

In Denmark, at the University of Aarhus, which was founded around 1930, a chair in art history was established in 1953 in order to set up a department.[25] Today, this department is a subdivision of the Department of Aesthetics and Communication. It is worth noting that the first professor at Aarhus was only the second female professor at any Danish university, and two out of a total number of five appointed professors at the department have been women. As in Denmark, the second Norwegian university only emerged in the middle of the twentieth century, when the University of Bergen was founded in 1946. Yet, the first candidates in art history were not to graduate until 1979, soon after the founding of the Department of Art History. Since 2007, this department has been a section of the Department of Linguistics, Literature and Aesthetics.[26]

The intellectual currents driving the formation of art history across the Nordic countries combined a concern for the promotion of local, that is, national, artistic traditions with the desire to engage with the latest international scholarly thinking. This also meant some notable collaborations. Lorenz Dietrichson founded the *Tidskrift för bildande Konst och Konstindustri* ('Journal of Art and Design') in Christiania in 1875, but the co-editors included Carl Estlander and Gustaf Ljunggren (1823–1905), an aesthetician based at the University of Lund. Dietrichson, Estlander, Julius

---

[23] It has been published by Routledge/Taylor & Francis since 1999.

[24] See 'Konstvetenskap vid ÅA. En kort historik', on the website of Åbo Akademi University, http://web.abo.fi/fak/hf/konstvet/ (accessed 9 March 2010).

[25] Else Kai Sass, 'Kunsthistorie', 317; See too the website of the Department of Art History, University of Aarhus, http://www.kunsthistorie.au.dk/index.jsp (accessed 9 March 2010).

[26] See the website of the Department of Linguistics, Literature and Aesthetics, University of Bergen, http://www.hf.uib.no/lle/ (accessed 26 April 2010).

Lange and Carl Rupert Nyblom (1832–1907) at the University of Uppsala also collaborated on a joint publication, *Nordiskt Konstnärsalbum* ('Album of Nordic Art') in 1878 showcasing the twenty most popular artworks across Scandinavia, and which was published simultaneously in Copenhagen, Christiania, Helsinki and Stockholm. In Denmark, Høyen's mission had been to elevate national Danish sentiment, whereas Julius Lange introduced scholarly methods in accordance with European university practices.[27] In Lange's case this involved not only stimulation from Hippolyte Taine's positivism but also a critical engagement with Hegelianism (which he initially adopted from Høyen).[28]

Prior to the late 1880s, art history in Sweden had been taught, in part and non-systematically, as part of the discipline of aesthetics, by Nyblom and Ljunggren. In the early twentieth century, the discipline of aesthetics was dissolved and in effect divided into two departments: literary history with poetics, and art history with art theory. The shift bespoke a desire for more empirical, positivist approaches, in tune with international currents. Accordingly, Swedish art history became increasingly oriented towards German models of inquiry, and links to Berlin were particularly strong. In the early twentieth century art history in Sweden was also strongly influenced by practices of stylistic analysis and iconography, as represented by the figures of Heinrich Wölfflin and Adolph Goldschmidt. The most brilliant representative of this epoch in Sweden would be Johnny Roosval (1879–1965); completing his doctorate in Berlin in 1903, Roosval worked first at the University of Uppsala then at the University of Stockholm. Like Tikkanen, he achieved a major international reputation, lecturing at Princeton and Harvard, and organizing the CIHA Congress of 1933 in Stockholm.[29] The Congress, devoted to the study of national art and national styles, foreshadowed the subsequent traumatic political events of the 1930s, but Roosval himself had been concerned with exploring the idea of transnational artistic regions.[30] After the War it was the

---

[27] Hans Dam Christensen, 'Billedkunsten: Om kunsthistorikeren N.L. Høyen og folkets billedkunst', in *Veje til danskheden: Bidrag til den moderne nationale selvforståelse*, ed. Palle Ove Christiansen (Copenhagen, 2005) 66–94.

[28] Hanne Kolind Poulsen, 'Fra Ånd til Videnskab: Julius Lange og positivismen', in Christensen, Poulsen, and Larsen, eds., *Viljen til det menneskelige*, 67–86.

[29] Dan Karlholm, 'Vetenskapens vardag', in Johansson, and Pettersson, eds*., 8 kapitel*, 93–118. See Johnny Roosval, ed., *Actes du XIIIᵉ Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art* (Stockholm, 1933).

[30] In the 1920s Roosval had proposed the idea of a 'Nordic-Baltic' artistic region. See Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, 'Early Modern Ideas about Artistic Geography Regarding the Baltic Region', *Scandinavian Journal of History* 28 (2003) 263–72.

more traditionally humanist iconology of Erwin Panofsky that provided the dominant international model, and the students of Gregor Paulsson (1889–1977) in Uppsala from 1934–56, contributed to a significant internationalization of the research of art history.[31]

In Finland the relation to international scholarship shifted during the twentieth century. Tikkanen was instrumental in establishing Italy as a subject of research, beginning with his dissertation on Giotto. Although his most important fields would later be psalter illustrations and the iconography of facial expressions, gestures and movement, he provided an example for others, such as Okkonen, who also worked on Italian art. His interest in international art was also taken up by his student Sirén who, having initially published research on Italy, later became a scholar of Chinese art.[32] However, although a pupil of Tikkanen, Sirén's subsequent career in Stockholm means that he belongs more within the history of the discipline in Sweden. While Okkonen's early work fitted within this pattern, he later came to focus on nineteenth- and twentieth-century Finnish art, and for much of the twentieth century the national paradigm came to dominate art-historical research in Finland. In part this paralleled wider currents in European art history, but it also reflected a genuine concern that for linguistic reasons Finnish art would otherwise be neglected by scholars elsewhere. It was not until the 1980s that this orientation came to be challenged.

From the late 1960s onwards most countries registered a seismic change, which included both a broadening of the discipline—to include visual culture, feminism and critical theory—and an expansion of the number of institutions where it was taught. In Finland, a Society of Art Historians ('Föreningen för konsthistoria/Taidehistorian Seura') was finally established in 1973, the only academic association in Finland with an exclusive focus on art history and art research. A national journal, the *Taidehistoriallisia Tutkimuksia/Konsthistoriska studier* (Studies in Art History) based at the Department of Art History, Helsinki, was also founded by the Society in 1974. Art history began to be taught at other institutions too; at

---

[31] Allan Ellenius, 'Art History', in *Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University, History, Art and Philosophy*, ed. Carl Göran Andrae (Uppsala, 1976) 11–18; Hans Pettersson, *Gregor Paulsson och den konsthistoriska tolkningens problem* (Stockholm and Stehag, 1997).

[32] Sirén was originally a scholar of medieval and Quattrocento Florentine art, but then later published numerous studies of Chinese art including *Histoire des Arts anciens de la Chine* (Paris, 1929–30) and *The Gardens of China* (New York, 1949). See Minna Törmä, 'Decade of Change: 1920's in the Life of Osvald Sirén', in Suominen-Kokkonen and Vakkari, eds., *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, 157–68.

the University of Jyväskylä lectures were first delivered on art history and theory in 1967, and it received its first professorial chair in 1971, with an emphasis, first, on contemporary art, and later, in the 1980s, on ecclesiastical art and architecture.[33] At the University of Turku (first established in 1920) a chair of art history was installed in 1992, although this was preceded by a personal professorship from 1987. In art history, one of six disciplines within the School of Art Studies, the emphasis of the research and teaching of art history is on Finnish art and architecture. Lectures in art history are held in Finnish, while, in a reflection of the changing landscape of the discipline internationally, exams and essays may be in English.[34] Such institutional diversification was evident, too, in the case of the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts in Helsinki, which was granted university status in 1993 and runs a Master's program in art.[35]

The Universities of Technology in Helsinki, Tampere and Oulu have Departments of Architectural History. A minor in art history is also obtainable from the Universities of Tampere, from Oulu and Rovaniemi. Since 1999 there has also been a national Finnish Graduate School in Art History, which covers all departments of the country and includes also a Summer School, to which international scholars are invited each year. Finally, in 1998, the Institute for Art Research was established at the University of Helsinki (incorporated, in 2010, into a larger Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies). It links art history to related disciplines, signalling a conceptual realignment of art history with other areas. It covers all the major arts including architecture, 'their history and their contemporary developments as well as aesthetic questions related to environment in general'.[36] The Institute produces significant quantities of bilingual (Finnish and Swedish or English) publications, which aim to reach a wider international audience, and which, in another sign of external influences (specifically, Britain), was singled out for praise in the 2005 Research Assessment Exercise.[37] Alongside traditional topics, art history

---

[33] University of Jyväskylä, Art History. See: http://www.jyu.fi/hum/laitokset/taiku/en/subjects/arthistory/ (accessed 9 March 2010).

[34] University of Turku, Department of Art history, http://vanha.hum.utu.fi/taidehistoria/eng_index.html (accessed 9 March, 2008).

[35] Jan Kaila, ed., *The Artist's Knowledge: Research at the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts*, available at: http://www.kuva.fi/attachments/jatkotutkinto/tohtorit.pdf (accessed 9 March, 2010).

[36] University of Helsinki, Institute for Art Research, http://www.helsinki.fi/taitu/english/research.htm (accessed 9 March 2010).

[37] University of Helsinki, *Research Assessment Exercise 2005, Evaluation Report* (Helsinki, 2005) 3.

now includes the study of visual culture, museology, historiography, gender studies and design history. It is indicative of shifts in the discipline that the first female professor, Riitta Nikula, was also appointed in 1994 in Helsinki. The total number of doctoral dissertations in art history in Finland at the time of writing (2009) is 139, with the overwhelming majority, some 100, based at the Department of Art History in Helsinki.[38]

A similar reshaping of the discipline occurred in Sweden. Art history is now taught at eight universities and two university colleges. The decisive difference between these two arenas for higher education is that a 'högskola', regardless of its academic rating, lacks examination rights for doctorates, and has to negotiate a contract with a university for the examination of its graduate students.[39] Graduate research studies are now possible at the Universities of Göteborg, Lund, Stockholm, Umeå and Uppsala. In addition, one year Master's programmes are delivered by the Universities of Karlstad and Linköping, and what are still technically university colleges (högskolor): Gotland University and Södertörn University. At Linnaeus University (a recently established merger of Växjö University and Kalmar University College), art history and visual culture studies have been taught since the late 1990s, and the right to supervise doctoral candidates was granted in 2007. Architectural history has always been an integral part of the discipline of art history in Sweden, and architectural history also comprises an element of the general architectural programme at the School of Architecture and the Built Environment at the 'Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan' (the Royal Institute of Technology or KTH) in Stockholm. However, in addition to architectural training, the KTH runs a doctoral research programme in architectural history. Art academies have also begun to come into their own as sites of practice-based art research; the first three PhD students graduated at Malmö Art Academy (connected to Lund University) in 2006; alongside Malmö there is also Valand School of Fine Arts, connected to the University of Gothenburg.[40]

Although such expansion represents, on the one hand, a positive shift, a major issue for the field of art history in Sweden today is the structural overproduction of students, as well as the as yet unfinished process of

---

[38] Suominen-Kokkonen and Vakkari, eds., *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*. See especially 231–39. The editors have corrected the figure mentioned in the book.

[39] The power relations are often disguised in translation, as many högskolor have decided to translate the term 'högskola' into English as 'university' plain and simple. The situation has been alleviated since 2010, when 'högskolor' can seek graduate examination rights for multi-disciplinary "research areas".

[40] See *Konstnärligt FoU, Årsbok* (Stockholm, 2004–07) and Mika Hannula, Julia Suoranta, and Tere Vadén, eds., *Artistic Research: Theories, Methods and Practices* (Gothenburg, 2005).

adapting to the Bologna declaration. Moreover, 75% of the students are female, although the figure decreases significantly at advanced and faculty level. Other problems persist; a recent national evaluation by the Swedish Board of Higher Education of several subjects within the arts and humanities, art history among them, observed a tendency towards disciplinary isolation. Exchange opportunities nationally and internationally, for both students and academic researchers, are also poorly developed. Moreover, in contrast to the unified doctoral program, such as that recently instituted in Finland at the Graduate School of Art History, for example, local variations prevail.[41]

Alongside such institutional diversification, the identity of the discipline has also been questioned. Instead of the traditional label of 'Konsthistoria' (literally: 'art history'), most departments devoted to the study of art, architecture and other visual objects and environments, have opted for some other label. The most general denomination, 'Konstvetenskap' (denoting the theoretical and historical study of art and aesthetics) is used in Gotland (founded in 1998), Stockholm, Södertörn (established 2003), Umeå (established in 1975) and Uppsala, a development that parallels the example of Åbo in Finland cited earlier. In a shift echoing the rise of image theory, or 'Bildwissenschaft' in Germany, 'Konstvetenskap' at the University of Göteborg (established in 1947) was renamed 'Konst- och Bildvetenskap', in 2000, indicating an emphasis on non-art pictures alongside the traditional objects of art history. In 2004 the same nomenclature was adopted at the University of Karlstad, although in this case the causes were different, being due to the merger of art history and studio art practice. At the University of Linköping (established in 1985), art history is taught within the framework of 'Konstvetenskap och visuell kommunikation' (Art history and visual communication).

More generally, the opportunities to study visual culture within or without the discipline of art history have increased in recent years, with programmes having opened up at the University of Linköping and at Skövde University College (in Skövde, north-east of Gothenburg).[42] In 2008, the sociologist Árni Sverrisson was appointed the first Professor of Visual Culture at Högskolan Dalarna (Dalarna University College). These changing frameworks suggest a significant shift in approaches to the study

---

[41] *Utvärdering av ämnena film-, konst-, musik- och teatervetenskap vid svenska universitet och högskolor. Kvalitetsgranskning, Rapport 2007: 19R*, Högskoleverket/Swedish National Agency for Higher Education (Stockholm, 2007).
[42] Courses are taught at Linköping, Skövde and Falun, for example.

of the visual image, which has involved expanding beyond the traditional dominance of art history. Indeed, the late 1960s witnessed a turn towards images at large, social history, feminism and visual communication. The empirical, and to some extent, theoretical scope of the field expanded considerably, and prefigured many of the issues that were to occupy Anglo-American visual studies from the 1990s onwards. In this regard, however, it should be noted that it is nevertheless difficult on occasion to discern new disciplinary contents from new labels for art history, such as sociology, film and communication studies, or 'konstvetenskap'. The landscape of art history is mixed, for despite such innovations, a majority of art-historical research is devoted to traditional topics in national art. Against this, however, an increasing number of dissertations (of which there are over 400 by now) are written in English.

Although art history was formally recognized in Denmark earlier than in any of the other Nordic countries, subsequent institutional and professional expansion has been limited. It was not until 1979 that the 'Dansk Kunsthistoriker Forening' (The Association of Danish Art Historians) was founded, with the aim of promoting national and international scholarly contact.[43] The teaching of art history continues to be restricted to two institutions: the University of Copenhagen and the University of Aarhus. These two universities, the largest by far in Denmark, and with regard to art history, approximately equal in numbers of students and staff, are dominant in other ways. They are home, for example, to the two leading research journals entirely devoted to art history, published on a regular basis, both launched in the beginning of the 1990s. *Passepartout. Skrifter for kunsthistorie* (Passepartout. Art-historical Writings) is published by the Department of Art History in Aarhus, while *Periskop. Forum for kunsthistorisk debat* (Periscope. Forum for Art-historical Debates) originated in the progressive students' milieu in the University of Copenhagen.[44]

This can be contrasted, however, with the growth of visual studies at other institutions, including the former Danish University School of Education at the University of Aarhus and the Department of Communication at Roskilde University, and also with the fact that at both Copenhagen

---

[43] Hans Dam Christensen, 'Hvad er kunsthistorie? Betragtninger over kulturforskningens nutid og fremtid', in *Det kunsthistoriske studieapparat. Hånd- og debatbog fra den videnskabelige hverdag*, ed. Hans Dam Christensen and Louise C. Larsen (Copenhagen, 2004) 263–4.

[44] Hans Dam Christensen, *Forskydningens kunst*, 44; *Passepartout. Skrifter for kunsthistorie*, http://www.pptout.dk/ (accessed 26 April 2010).

and Aarhus the nature and scope of the discipline has been substantially revised over recent decades. Art-historical research at the University of Copenhagen was oriented towards iconographical studies until the early 1990s, while the younger department in Aarhus more easily matured in dialogue with new currents in social history, critical Theory, and Marxism. As a consequence, the breakthrough of 'new art history' some twenty years ago represented a very obvious change of direction in Copenhagen whereas in the University of Aarhus adjustment to the new tendencies was much less disruptive.[45] This was evident in a number of ways, including their approach to revising the curriculum; whereas the Institut for Kunst- og Kulturvidenskab (Institute of Art and Cultural Studies) in Copenhagen launched a Master's programme in visual culture ('Visuel kultur') as an alternative to the 'real' art history programme, the department in Aarhus chose to integrate visual studies within the existing programmes.[46]

Until the early 1970s there continued to be only two universities in Norway where art history could be studied: Bergen and Oslo. In comparison with the Department of Art History at the University of Oslo, the younger department in Bergen adjusted more easily to a multidisciplinary milieu including visual communication and visual studies. The University includes, for example, a research group in visual culture ('visuell kultur') that explicitly declares its affiliation to the work of, amongst others, Michael Baxandall, James Elkins, W.J.T. Mitchell and John Tagg.[47] Hence, too, its recently established MA programme in art history is open to wide-ranging topics concerning visuality and history, while the department also offers a BA programme in Visual Culture in collaboration with the Department of Information and Media Studies. In 2008, this department also launched *Nomadikon*, a transdisciplinary research group and centre for image studies and visual aesthetics.[48]

---

[45] Hans Dam Christensen, 'Which Art History?' in *Is Art History Global?*, ed. James Elkins (London, 2006) 298–309; Hans Dam Christensen, *Forskydningens kunst*, 42.

[46] Hans Dam Christensen and Helene Illeris, Introduction, in *Visuel kultur: Viden, Liv, Politik*, ed. Dam Christensen and Helene Illeris (Copenhagen, 2009) 9–23. See also special issues on visual culture in *Periskop: Forum for kunsthistorisk debat* 9 (2000) and *Passepartout. Skrifter for kunsthistorie* 24 (2004). See also the webpage http://visuelkultur.ku.dk/ (accessed 1 March 2010).

[47] See the departmental website: http://www.uib.no/fg/visuellkultur (accessed 1 March 2010). Listed research projects include the study of marginal archaeological sites in the Mediterranean (with particular focus on the ancient Greek city of Tegea), nineteenth-century devotional medals, and official royal portraiture since 1905.

[48] See the webpage, http://www.nomadikon.net/ContentItem.aspx?ci=2 (accessed 1 March 2010).

Since the 1970s there has been a notable growth in the number of Norwegian institutions teaching art history or visual studies. A third art-historical programme, affiliated to the University of Tromsø, was founded in 1972. The Department of Art History, established in 1997 and now a section of the Department of Culture and Literature, replaced art history with the term 'Kunstvitenskap' in 2003 (paralleling Sweden, and again borrowing from the German 'Kunstwissenschaft'), apparently in order to include aesthetics and broader historical subjects as well as a contemporary visual culture. In this context 'Kunstvitenskap' encompasses art theory and methodologies of analysis, visual argumentation and visualization, the role of vision in the mechanisms of spatio-temporal orientation, identity and power.[49] The current BA programme offers specializations in both art history and the protection of cultural heritage, and the MA programme aims at the broad inclusion of the history of visual culture. Outside this department and the Faculty of the Arts, it is, however, possible to obtain an English-language Master's degree in visual cultural studies at the Department of Archaeology and Social Anthropology in the Faculty of the Social Sciences. In keeping with its institutional location, this programme aims at 'the creation of knowledge about people's life-worlds and cosmologies based on the use of qualitative social science research methods and documentary film'.[50]

A fourth art-historical programme was founded in 1997 at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU, formerly the University of Trondheim). In fact, the current Section of Art History was added to an existing Department of Art and Media Studies, which included studies in film, dance, and theatre as well. At present, the art-historical BA programme offers three branches of specialization: (1) medieval art and architectural history; (2) nineteenth and twentieth-century art and architecture, in particular modern and contemporary art, and (3) the theory of art and its relation to art history.[51] The adjacent Section of Media Studies, which originated from a tradition of visual communication studies at the previous University of Trondheim, offers a Master's programme in

---

[49] See the webpage 'Fra kunsthistorie til kunstvitenskap' on the website of the Department of Art History, University of Tromsø: http://www.hum.uit.no/kun/ (accessed 9 March 2010).

[50] See the departmental website at: http://www2.uit.no/ikbViewer/page/ansatte/organis asjon/hjem?p_dimension_id=88154&p_menu=42374&p_lang=2 (accessed 21 February 2010).

[51] See the website of the Institute of Art and Media Studies at NTNU: http://www.ntnu .no/studier/kunsthistorie (accessed 9 March 2010).

Medievitenskap og Visuell kultur (media studies and visual culture). Further, a Master's programme in Kunstkritikk og Kulturformidling (art criticism and cultural communication) is delivered in collaboration between the two sections.[52] The range of PhD topics within the institute reflects this broad disciplinary mix; subjects include: the history of Norwegian art criticism from 1820 to 1940; the aesthetics of Japanese popular culture; and the young male nude in Norwegian late nineteenth-century photography.[53]

A fifth art history programme, affiliated to the University of Stavanger, was founded in 2004. This is a one-year elective study programme which might be included in the BA programme in arts and culture studies. While the obligatory programme elements consist primarily of survey courses on the history of art, the broader elective elements include the sociology of culture as well as visual culture and the study of material culture. At Master's level the study of art is integrated into a wider programme in cultural studies ('Kunst og kulturvitenskap'). With options in aesthetics and art theory, epistemology, urbanization and qualitative research methods, its orientation is strongly towards the model of the social sciences rather than traditional art history.

Despite the many commonalities and parallel developments, it would be difficult to speak of the Nordic countries as a single unit or region. Many differences remain between the respective traditions of the countries, most of which are due to linguistic differences and a sheer lack of effort to build inter-Nordic collaborations on a more sustained and general level. This has been partly addressed by the establishment of NORDIK, the Nordic Committee for Art History, which has organized conferences every third year since 1984, and which has been important for professional exchange among the Nordic countries; as a sign of the increasing visibility of visual studies, the theme of the 2006 conference was 'Tradition and Visual Culture'.[54] One may also mention the Nordic Society of Aesthetics ('Nordiska sällskapet för estetik'), which was founded in Uppsala in 1983 and publishes the 'bi'-lingual ('Scandinavian'-English) *Nordisk Estetisk Tidskrift* ('Nordic Journal of Aesthetics') that has included theory-oriented

---

[52] See the website of the Faculty of Asthetics, Art and Music: http://www.ntnu.no/studier/kunstkritikk (accessed 9 March 2010).

[53] Listed on the Institute website: http://www.ntnu.no/ikm/forskning/phd (accessed 9 March 2010).

[54] See the website of the Nordik 2006 conference: http://nordik.uib.no/nordik2006/english.html (accessed 9 March 2010), and the main website http://nordicarthistory.org.

contributions on art (since 1988). On the other hand, while there is a high degree of professional interchange between Denmark and Norway, which are also closest linguistically, there is much less co-operation between scholars in these countries and Sweden. Even between Swedes and the Swedish-Finnish segment of art historians (with Swedish as their first language), connections have been largely fortuitous and personal, rather than being sustained and organized on a more formal level. Finland remains the most isolated country of this quartet from a Scandinavian perspective—it frequently has closer connections with Germany, Britain or Estonia to the South—not to mention Iceland, which has sometimes been represented at NORDIK by only one or two people.

Following the general trend toward research into historiography and the history of the discipline in France and the English- and German-speaking world since the 1980s, there has been an upsurge of historiographical interest within all of these nations. This has been accompanied by a shift in approaches. Traditionally most Nordic research hitherto had dealt with the history of famous professors and, to a lesser degree, with the evolution of institutions and the academic art world. However, in keeping with developments in other countries, the new historiographical wave introduced an engagement with critical theories, which consequently have had an impact in the discourses and practices of art history, and with how the discipline has reflected on itself.[55] In particular, challenges from the interdisciplinary field of visual culture, doctoral programmes in fine art, new digital technology for research, teaching and publication, along with the demands of working and publishing in a globalized world, have also changed art history in the Nordic countries as elsewhere in Europe. Currently, an inter-Nordic researcher network, *Visions of the Past: Images as Historical Sources and the History of Art History*, which combines visual studies and the historiography of art history, is operating. It is funded by NordForsk, a Nordic research board with responsibility for co-operation on research and researcher training in the Nordic region. NordForsk is also funding *Nordens samtida bildvärld/Nordic Network on Visual Studies.* This researcher network is, however, almost entirely without involvement of art historians. Instead, it is dominated by sociologists, ethnographers and anthropologists as a case in point of the diversification of visual studies in

---

[55] See, for example, Dan Karlholm, *Handböckernas Konsthistoria: Om skapandet av 'allmän konsthistoria' i Tyskland under 1800-talet* (Stockholm, 1996); Hans Dam Christensen, *Forskydningens kunst: Kritiske bidrag til kunsthistoriens historie* (Copenhagen, 2001).

the Nordic countries—a diversification which will lead too far to follow in this context.[56]

One final important development merits further comment; amongst students of art history or visual studies, contemporary art and recent or current visual culture have come to displace historical topics as the main foci of attention. This trend, if sustained, may well have important consequences for the discipline of art history (including museums of art) which may well suffer in the longer term. The 'history' within 'art history' seems to attract much less interest than the 'art'. On the one hand, the infrastructure for academic studies of art has expanded and improved immensely in all four Nordic countries covered in this chapter, with the number of students remaining high or increasing. On the other hand, their interests, although widening in geopolitical and cultural terms, not least due to the added influence of cultural economics stressing the contemporaneity of culture, seem to have narrowed historically. The central position of 'art' within visual culture has been diminishing for some time now; it may be that art history itself will undergo a similar fate. A further likely future development will be a growing division between, on the one hand, museum professionals and art-historical researchers with their special interests and, on the other, autonomous university departments merging with or yielding to a transgressive discipline of visual/art/culture studies, where research is interest- and issues-driven, rather than medium-, nation- or epoch-based.

---

[56]   See the webpages http://visual.sociology.su.se/ and http://groups.google.com/group/nordic-visual-studies/topics?start (accessed 1 March 2010).

A MARGINALIZED TRADITION? POLISH ART HISTORY

Wojciech Bałus

Art history as an academic discipline and subject of academic education appeared in Poland in the second half of the nineteenth century, although an interest in the field can be traced back to the Enlightenment.[1] The institutionalization of art history first took place in Cracow, the historic centre of Polish culture and, at the time, under Austrian rule. The first stage in this process was the creation of the Commission of Art History at the Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1873. The programme of its activities involved the inventorying of Polish monuments, the publication of written sources relating to the history of Polish art and preparation of the first monographs on works of art.[2]

  This early institutionalization process culminated in the creation of the first chair of art history in 1882, which was established within the Jagiellonian University at Cracow. The chair was entrusted to Marian Sokołowski (1839–1911).[3] A trained historian, who had studied in Berlin and Vienna, Sokołowski moved with ease and versatility within the spheres of ancient, medieval, Byzantine and Renaissance art, placing each of the analysed works of art within a wide comparative background and without neglecting its broader historical context. When writing about Polish art, he always tried to portray it as an integral part of the European legacy.[4] In his university lectures, he perceived art history as a part of the history of culture, and in this he was emulating a model consolidated in Berlin by Carl Schnaase and developed in Leipzig by Anton Springer. Studying briefly under Rudolf von Eitelberger, he was also influenced by art-historical practice in Vienna.[5] Operating in Galicia, the part of Polish territory

---

[1] Adam Małkiewicz, *Z dziejów polskiej historii sztuki: Studia i szkice* (Cracow, 2005) 96–9.

[2] Lech Kalinowski, 'Dzieje i dorobek naukowy Komisji Historii Sztuki Akademii Umiejętności i Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności 1873–1952 oraz powstanie Katedry Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1882', in *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce: Kształtowanie się instytucji naukowych w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. Adam S. Labuda (Poznań, 1996) 25–33.

[3] Kalinowski, 'Dzieje i dorobek naukowy', 39–43; Małkiewicz, *Z dziejów*, 34.

[4] Małkiewicz, *Z dziejów*, 35–6.

[5] Magdalena Kunińska 'Wykład historii sztuki na podstawie historii cywilizacji. Historia sztuki Mariana Sokołowskiego' (PhD Dissertation, Cracow, 2012).

under Austrian rule, Sokołowski benefitted from the liberal regime of the Habsburg Empire; in contrast to events in Prussian-ruled Poznań or Warsaw in Tsarist Russia, Galicia was not subject to policies of enforced Germanization or Russification. Together with the liberalization of Austro-Hungary in the second half of the nineteenth century, Galicia enjoyed considerable autonomy, and with it a chance to cultivate the national culture and language.[6] Nevertheless, Sokołowski did not put particular emphasis on the 'Polish' character of the phenomena which were the subject of his research and had no reservations about accentuating foreign elements in Polish art; this included, for example, recognition that the late-Gothic woodcarving in Cracow was the work of German artists. On the other hand, the Polonization of research by other scholars led to the marginalization of Polish art history, a phenomenon which has continued almost until today. This stood in contrast to work by, for example, August Essenwein on Gothic art in Cracow, published in German in the middle of the nineteenth century, which was almost instantly mentioned in the textbooks by the leading authors such as Franz Kugler.[7]

Eleven years after the establishment of the chair in Cracow, a second chair of art history was created on Polish territory in 1893, this time at Jan Kazimierz University in Lvov, the then capital of Galicia. It was occupied by Jan Bołoz Antoniewicz (1858–1922).[8] Trained in philosophy and literature, his approached differed from that of Sokołowski. Whereas the latter approached art in a positivist vein, Antoniewicz understood a work of art as the expression of mental life quite independent of the course of historical events. For Antoniewicz the history of art was thus not a historical, but a philological discipline, as philology is 'an ability to read a text, in the broadest and deepest sense of this word'.[9] This was in accordance with the concept of philology as synonymous with the science of deciphering the meaning of all texts, that is, hermeneutics.[10]

---

[6] Wojciech Bałus, *Krakau zwischen Traditionen und Wegen in die Moderne: Zur Geschichte der Architektur und der öffentlichen Grünanlagen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2003) 13–14.

[7] August von Essenwein, *Die mittelalterlichen Kunstdenkmale der Stadt Krakau* (Leipzig, 1869).

[8] Małkiewicz, *Z dziejów*, 42.

[9] Jan Bołoz Antoniewicz, 'Historya, filologia i historya sztuki', *Eos* 3 (1897) 23.

[10] Ksawery Piwocki, 'Lwowskie środowisko historyków sztuki', *Folia Historiae Artium* 4 (1967) 119–20; Wojciech Bałus, 'Historia sztuki wobec nauk historycznych', in *Dzieło sztuki: źródło ikonograficzne, czy coś więcej?*, ed. Marcin Fabiański (Warsaw, 2005) 37–40.

   After Poland had recovered its independence in 1918, art history continued to be taught at the universities of Cracow and Lvov; it also gained a place at the newly created University of Poznań as well as in the revived universities of Warsaw and Vilnius (at the latter, it was somewhat atypically incorporated into the Faculty of Fine Arts).[11] As regards the approach to research, it was the Cracow model that seemed to predominate. Thus, works of art were analysed from the point of view of their stylistic elements; formal and comparative analysis was supported with historical data. This pragmatic-positivist attitude seemed to characterize not only the followers of Sokołowski, but also scholars from the new centres such as Szczęsny Dettloff (1878–1961), professor at the University of Poznań and Zygmunt Batowski (1876–1944), who was more of an archivist than art historian, but who nevertheless had obtained the chair in Warsaw.[12] It was only in Lvov that the methodological interests initiated by Antoniewicz were continued. His student Władysław Podlacha (1875–1951), for example, understood a work of art as an expression of mental life which was reflected in the structure and expression of a painting or a sculpture. Thus form was of interest to him, not as a stylistic basis for dating a given item and for defining the place of its origin, but rather as a record of the spirit. This conception had clear parallels with the better-known notion of art history as the history of ideas ('Geistesgeschichte') of Max Dvořák and his students (including Otto Benesch).[13] However, Podlacha was more influenced by Heinrich Wölfflin; his analysis of art as a record of mental life used categories drawn from Wölfflin and on that basis he tried to create his own classification of art that would be independent of historical transformations.[14]

   The Second World War brought about deep political changes in Poland. Above all, the frontiers of the state shifted considerably, as a consequence of which the universities of Lvov and Vilnius no longer functioned as Polish educational institutions. Both were now in the Soviet Union while,

---

[11] Józef Poklewski, 'Katedra Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Stefana Batorego w Wilnie 1922–1939', in Labuda, ed. *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce*, 203–12.

[12] Adam S. Labuda, 'Horyzont wielkopolski, horyzont europejski. Seminarium historii sztuki Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego 1919–1939', in Labuda, ed. *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce*, 156–67; Małkiewicz, *Z dziejów*, 45–6 and 72–3.

[13] See Max Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte: Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung* (Vienna, 1924); Otto Benesch, *Collected Writings*, 4 vols. (London, 1970–73).

[14] Piwocki 'Lwowskie środowisko', 121–4; Mieczysław Zlat, 'O twórczości i poglądach Władysława Podlachy (1875–1951)', in *Myśl o sztuce*, ed. Teresa Hrankowska (Warsaw, 1976) 295–311.

conversely, as a result of the expulsion of Germans from Silesia after 1945, Poland took over the former University of Breslau (now the University of Wrocław). The staff of the University of Vilnius were transferred to Toruń, thereby creating the nucleus of the Nicolaus Copernicus University, whereas the staff of the University of Lvov created the University of Wrocław. Other new universities were also brought into existence.

At the present moment, the history of art is taught at ten Polish universities, the majority of which conduct courses leading to BA and MA degrees. The institutes that enjoy the strongest position in terms of academic staff, consisting of around twenty researchers each and having between 300 and 400 students, are to be found at the Jagiellonian University of Cracow, the University of Warsaw, the Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań, the University of Wrocław and the Catholic University of Lublin. Each of the above institutes is entitled to confer doctoral degrees and each publishes its own academic journal (*Modus. Prace z Historii Sztuki*—Jagiellonian University, *Ikonotheka*—University of Warsaw, *Artium Quaestiones*—University of Poznań, *Quart*—University of Wrocław and *Historia Sztuki* published within the series *Roczniki Humanistyczne*—Catholic University of Lublin). Smaller institutes, consisting of a dozen or so academic staff and having between 200 and 300 students, are to be found at the University of Łódź, the University of Gdańsk, at the Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński University of Warsaw, the John Paul II Papal University in Cracow and the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń. Besides the history of art, in Toruń there is also the Institute for the Study and Conservation of Monuments, which, in accordance with the Vilnius tradition, is located within the Faculty of Fine Arts.[15]

Another important political change which occurred in post-war Poland was the imposition of the Communist system. The tough Stalinist line continued throughout the period from 1949 to 1957, and the Marxist-Leninist character of education gained the official seal of approval. The activity of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences in Cracow was suspended and in its place the Polish Academy of Sciences, formed on the Soviet model, was instituted. Scholars who were particularly strongly opposed to the new authorities, such as Dettloff, lost their positions. In 1949, the State Institute

---

[15] Adam Małkiewicz, 'History of Art at the Jagiellonian University 1882–2007', in *Historia sztuki na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim 1882–2007/History of Art at the Jagiellonian University 1882–2007* (Cracow, 2007) 13–21; Labuda, *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce*, 213–93; Jarosław Jarzewicz, Janusz Pazder and Tadeusz J. Żuchowski, eds., *Historia sztuki dziś* (Warsaw, 2010).

of Art, subordinated directly to the Ministry of Culture and Art, was created; it was to become an important instrument for the implementation of the new cultural policy of the state. Research guidelines and academic priorities were established at specially organized training sessions. The history of art was divided into 'progressive' and 'backward' periods. From now on, scholars were to deal exclusively with the progressive periods and movements, which included the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and Realism.[16] In 1954, at a session that took place in Wrocław, research guidelines relating to the Polish Western Territories, incorporated into Poland after the war, were formulated. The chief principle was that scholars were to reveal and emphasize all symptoms of Polishness, whereas monuments which had a predominantly German—and above all Prussian character—were to be ignored.[17] Yet, in all those declarations there was more rhetoric and pragmatism than real belief in Communist doctrine.[18] Apart from preparing propaganda materials and occasional academic sessions, the State Institute of Art commenced work on inventorying monuments on the territory of the entire country; it also published translations of sources on the history of art theory (before 1957, there appeared, for instance, translations of Cennino Cennini, Albrecht Dürer and Nicolas Poussin). For political reasons, the historical scope of the Renaissance period became so extended, that within it scholars could work, for instance, on Gothic art of the fifteenth century. All in all, the Stalinization of Polish art history was not as severe as it might initially have seemed.

Following the 'thaw' of 1957, the strategy of the Communist authorities in Poland changed. To use the words of Michel Foucault, the brutal 'punishment' of the Stalinist era was now supplanted with 'disciplining'.[19] Consequently, direct interference with art history disappeared. This discipline of knowledge was recognized as too marginal and insignificant to support the political system. In 1959, the State Institute of Art was incorporated into the Polish Academy of Sciences, and as a research institution it has continued to realize extensive and large-scale projects up to the present. These include the *Catalogue of Monuments of Art in Poland* and

---

[16] Elżbieta Gieysztor-Miłobędzka, 'Warszawski Instytut Sztuki—dzieło Juliusza Starzyńskiego', in Labuda, ed., *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce*, 246–57.

[17] Ewa Chojecka, 'Polnische "Westforschung" und das Syndrom des Eisernen Vorhangs', in *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der nationale Diskurs*, ed. Robert Born, Adam S. Labuda and Alena Janatková (Berlin, 2004) 414–15.

[18] Gieysztor-Miłobędzka, 'Warszawski Instytut Sztuki', 263.

[19] See Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York, 1977).

The Dictionary of Polish Artists, a synthesis of the history of Polish art and
the translation of sources on the history of art theory, which only recently
ceased publication.[20] At the same time, the pragmatism of academic life,
resulting from the awareness of being continually watched, meant that
movement was only permitted within the territory allowed by the offi-
cial policy of the Communist party. A consequence of this was the rise of
the ideal of academic research as politically uninvolved, aiming to find
pure, positivistic truth that would be distant from all symptoms of the
critics of ideology. This wish to eradicate all references to politics from
the academic discourse could be seen in, among others, the postulate of the
Cracow-based art historian Lech Kalinowski that the 'Marxist-Leninist'
term 'ideology' should be totally removed from the dictionary of medi-
eval art history.[21]

   After the war, the middle as well as the older generation of art historians
continued to develop a model of the discipline in keeping with guidelines
laid down by Sokołowski and which remained set in the period 1918–39.
In this model, a dominant role was played by stylistic analysis supported
by research into historical sources. Evidence of the recognition of formal
analysis could be found in the 1962 publication of the translation of Wölf-
flin's *Principles of Art History* with an Introduction by the now deceased
Podlacha.[22] At the same time, during the deepest years of the Stalinism
of the 1950s, four scholars began to assimilate the methods of iconology.
Among these were: Jan Białostocki (1921–1988) based in Warsaw, Zofia
Ameisenowa (1897–1967) and Lech Kalinowski (1920–2004) in Cracow,
and Zdzisław Kępiński (1911–1978) in Poznań.[23] Their papers appeared in
print only during the subsequent 'thaw', but were already circulated in
typescript and commented upon earlier (including Kalinowski's disserta-
tion on the Sigismund Chapel in the Cracow cathedral). In the case of
Białostocki and Kalinowski, the decision to adopt iconological methods
was the result both of their opposition to the traditional history of style,
and their lack of support for vulgar Marxism, as well as their wish to remain
within the orbit of Western culture. Through their readers and followers,

---

[20] Lech Sokół, ed., *Instytut Sztuki Polskiej Akademii Nauk 1949–1999* (Warsaw, 2000).

[21] Lech Kalinowski, 'Sztuka średniowieczna a ideologia', in *Fermentum massae mundi: Jackowi Woźniakowskiemu w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. Nawojka Cieślińska and Piotr Rudziński (Warsaw, 1990) 357–62.

[22] Heinrich Wölfflin, *Podstawowe pojęcia historii sztuki: Problem rozwoju stylu w sztuce nowożytnej,* transl. Danuta Hanulanka (Wrocław, 1962).

[23] Małkiewicz, *Z dziejów*, 82–90; Zdzisław Kępiński, 'Symbolika Drzwi Gnieźnieńskich', in *Drzwi Gnieźnieńskie*, ed. Michał Walicki (Wrocław, 1959) 163.

the four managed to quickly popularize this way of practising art history. Towards the end of the 1960s, the iconological method had become so popular that Ksawery Piwocki (1901–1974) decided to intervene critically by referring back to the formal approach of Alois Riegl, with the intention of proving that no work of art 'is a symptom or document of an era' and that its study should always begin with 'morphological analysis'.[24]

The apogee of the iconologically oriented history of art was the book by Jan Białostocki, entitled *History of Art among the Humanistic Disciplines of Knowledge* which was written from the vantage point of his authority as a now internationally respected scholar, and which proved the continuing relevance and the universal applicability of this method.[25] At the same time there was a growing awareness that Panofsky's method had had its day. According to Lech Kalinowski, iconology had exhausted its cognitive value, becoming exclusively an efficient instrument for carrying out successive interpretations, yet without offering the possibility of posing new research questions.[26]

With increasing frequency, scholars began to talk of a crisis in the history of art—a crisis which consisted in the inability to change the *status quo*. An alternative method of conducting research on art was suggested by Mieczysław Porębski (b. 1921), based initially at the Academy of Fine Arts in Warsaw and later at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow. Beginning with his article 'Art and Information' (1962), Porębski developed an approach on the basis of French structuralism, cultural anthropology and information theory.[27] The chief subject matter of his work was the art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and in texts such as *Iconosphere* and *Art and Information* Porębski also tried to formulate a general theory of art and a conception of its development.[28] In 1973, a group of young historians of art from Poznań organized a discussion devoted to the critical analysis of the writings of German scholars belonging to the generation

---

[24] Ksawery Piwocki, *Pierwsza nowoczesna teoria sztuki: Poglądy Aloisa Riegla* (Warsaw, 1970) 325.

[25] Jan Białostocki, *Historia sztuki wśród nauk humanistycznych* (Wrocław, 1980) 32; Mariusz Bryl, 'Czy samobójstwo teorii historii sztuki? O "Bildwissenschaft", bałkanizacji, polskim kontekście i suwerenności sztuki', *Rocznik Historii Sztuki* 26 (2001) 7–8.

[26] Lech Kalinowski, 'Model funkcjonalny przekazu wizualnego na przykładzie renesansowego dzieła sztuki', in *Renesans: Sztuka i ideologia*, ed. Tadeus S. Jaroszewski (Warsaw, 1976) 166–7.

[27] Mieczysław Porębski, 'Sztuka a informacja', *Rocznik historii sztuki* 3 (1962) 44–111.

[28] Mieczysław Porębski, *Ikonosfera* (Warsaw, 1972); Porębski, *Sztuka a informacja* (Cracow, 1986).

of 1968 who engaged in *Ideologiekritik*.[29] From this moment on it was the Poznań milieu which reacted most actively to the changes taking place elsewhere, amongst others, by publishing in the journal *Artium Questiones* translations of important articles and using approaches associated with, on the one hand, the new art history (as in the work of Piotr Piotrowski and his followers), or, on the other, German-language hermeneutics (as in the case of Wojciech Suchocki, Mariusz Bryl and Michał Haake). The methodological propositions of Porębski as well as of the Poznań scholars were not, however, received with widespread acceptance.

The political transformations which took place in Poland following 1989 did not have any significant influence on Polish art history. In contrast to other post-Soviet states, perhaps, it was not necessary to make contact once more with scholarship worldwide, nor to 'de-Communize' the milieu of Polish art historians. This was to a large extent due to the efforts of individuals. Thus the Lvov-based scholar Karolina Lanckorońska, for example, who found herself an émigrée following the end of the war, had established the Lanckoroński of Brzezie Foundation in 1967; the Foundation granted scholarships to talented scholars from Poland, and enabled them to maintain awareness of scholarship abroad.[30] In addition, Jan Białostocki, being constantly in touch with academic research internationally, played a key role in transferring onto Polish soil the news of its latest achievements.[31] Having for a number of years held the post of president of the Association of Art Historians, he had a decisive impact on the shape of its annual conferences, the topics of which always reflected important international congresses and where he always delivered the introductory lecture.[32] In the Cracow milieu, a similar role was played by Lech Kalinowski who acted

---

[29] 'Dzieło sztuki między nauką i światopoglądem. Dyskusja w Rogalinie w dniu 14 listopada 1973 roku', in *Interpretacja dzieła sztuki: Studia i dyskusje*, ed. Janusz Kębłowski (Warsaw-Poznań, 1976) 149–227; Bryl, 'Czy samobójstwo', 7.

[30] Małkiewicz, *Z dziejów*, 154. Lanckorońska was imprisoned in Ravensbrück concentration camp during the German occupation of Poland. She subsequently published her memoirs of the period which were translated into English as *Michelangelo in Ravensbrück. One Woman's War against the Nazis*, trans. Noel Clark (New York, 2008).

[31] The reasons for Białostocki's immense international success have not yet been fully researched. Undoubtedly, besides his considerable academic achievements, and his linguistic and organizational skills, an important role was also played by the fact that he was quickly recognized as the only significant partner from behind the iron curtain, see Sergiusz Michalski, 'Jan Białostocki a ewolucja historii sztuki po roku 1945', in *Ars longa. Prace dedykowane pamięci profesora Jana Białostockiego*, ed. Maria Poprzęcka (Warsaw, 1999) 53.

[32] Piotr Skubiszewski, 'Miejsce Jana Białostockiego w polskiej historii sztuki', in Poprzęcka, ed., *Ars longa*, 20.

as a mediator in the process of assigning scholarships of the Lanckoroński Foundation. Thanks to his friendship with art historians of Polish descent in other countries, such as Louis Grodecki (based in Paris and Strasbourg) and George Zarnecki (based in London), he facilitated contacts with foreign scholars for colleagues who were going abroad.

The new political situation after 1989 also allowed scholars to overcome the taboo in the form of the German cultural legacy within the borders of Poland following the end of the war in 1945. Although research on the art of Silesia, Pomerania, Warmia and Mazuria had overstepped the boundaries delineated during the Stalinist period a long time ago, it was only now that it was possible fully to publicize its results.[33] There also arose joint Polish-German initiatives, such as the Working Group of German and Polish Art Historians ('Arbeitskreis deutscher und polnischer Kunsthistoriker') founded in 1988.[34] The opening of the eastern border of Poland after 1989 had also enabled exploration of the cultural heritage on the territories which used to belong to Poland in the past. At present, intense inventorying work is being conducted in Byelorussia and Ukraine. The team of Jan Ostrowski, professor at the Jagiellonian University, published nineteen volumes of *Materiały do dziejów sztuki sakralnej na Ziemiach Wschodnich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej* (Materials on the History of Sacred Art in the Eastern Territories of the Former Polish Commonwealth) and has achieved considerable results in this sphere.[35] On the other hand, a lack of critical reflection means that these monuments have not been viewed in any other way than as elements of Polish culture. Thus, no attempt has been made—within the framework of the humanities more broadly—to describe this 'unique experience, namely the experience which combines the aspect of colonization (by as many as three and, more precisely, four very different imperial powers: Prussia, Austria, Russia and the USSR) with the colonizing aspect (Poland as an empire comprising the territories and populations of Lithuania, Belorussia and Ukraine).'[36]

---

[33] Chojecka, 'Polnische "Westforschung"', 416–18.

[34] See www.bkge.de/arbeitskreis/5967.html (accessed 3 May 2010).

[35] Jerzy Kowalczyk, 'Review of Kościoły i klasztory rzymskokatolickie dawnego województwa ruskiego, t. 1–11, ed. J.K. Ostrowski, Kraków 1993–2003, Materiały do dziejów sztuki sakralnej na Ziemiach Wschodnich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej, cz. I. Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury w Krakowie', *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* 66 (2004) 391–401.

[36] Dariusz Skórczewski, 'Wobec eurocentryzmu, dekolonizacji i postmodernizmu. O niektórych problemach teorii postkolonialnej i jej polskich perspektywach', *Teksty Drugie* 1–2 (2008) 52.

The programme of teaching art history at university level assumes that students should become acquainted to an equal degree with all individual periods, from antiquity to the twentieth century. For this reason, institutes and chairs of art history strive to employ specialists in all disciplines. Nevertheless, one should distinguish here certain specializations which are particularly well developed in the individual centres. Thus, at the University of Warsaw, the tradition of research into the history of art-historical inquiry initiated by Jan Białostocki, is still being cherished. The problems of the theory and methodology of art constitute an important element of research and teaching at the University of Poznań and, for the last dozen or so years, at the Catholic University of Lublin (Elżbieta Wolicka, Ryszard Kasperowicz). Wojsław (Vojslav) Molè, a Slovenian scholar, who began to teach in Cracow in 1925, continued his career at the Jagiellonian University and initiated systematic research on Byzantine and Byzantine-Slavic art. This interest was subsequently taken up and further developed by his student Anna Różycka Bryzek (1928–2005) and it continues to be developed there up to the present.[37] Thanks to Piotr Krakowski (1925–1997) and Mieczysław Porębski, the art of the twentieth century was first taught at universities in the 1970s at the University of Cracow. At present it is taught everywhere and with regard to research on contemporary art, the University of Poznań (in the work of Piotr Piotrowski) and Cracow (Maria Hussakowska and Andrzej Szczerski) have played a leading role, although these issues are also of interest to the scholars at the University of Warsaw and at the Catholic University of Lublin.

The Association of Art Historians, which has more than 1,400 members, remains to date the most important discussion forum in Poland; every year it organizes conferences for the whole milieu of art historians, and every two years, it holds methodological seminars whose proceedings are regularly published in book form. Together with the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences, it also publishes a quarterly entitled *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki.* In 1990, the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences was reinstated in Cracow. Since 1995 a Commission of Art History, which publishes a yearbook entitled *Folia Historiae Artium. Seria Nowa*, has been operating under its auspices (in 1961–94, a Commission of the Theory and History of Art operated within the branch of the Polish Academy of

---

[37] In addition to Cracow, research on the history of Byzantine art is undertaken at both universities in Warsaw. See: Waldemar Ceran, 'Główne osiągnięcia polskich badań nad historią sztuki bizantyjskiej (do roku 1988)', in *Sztuka średniowiecznego Wschodu i Zachodu,* ed. Małgorzata Smorąg Różycka (Cracow, 2002) 12–39.

Sciences in Cracow; the first series of the yearly *Folia Historiae Artium* constituted its organ). Within the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, there is also a Committee on Art Studies which includes specialists not only in the sphere of art history, but also of musicology and theatre, although the Committee is of rather marginal significance. Its main organ is *Rocznik Historii Sztuki.*

At present, the dominant attitude among Polish art historians is that of 'doing business as usual'. The theoretical activity and debate which was a characteristic feature of the 1970s, has died down and since the 1980s there have been no widespread theoretical debates.[38] The universally accepted methodology remains totally positivistic in character. Postmodernist inspirations are in fact visible only among those scholars who deal with the most recent art (besides Piotrowski, one should mention here Maria Hussakowska and her collaborators in Cracow), whereas the hermeneutic method has had a relatively limited impact. The recent polemic against hermeneutics, conducted under the banner of defending 'historical facts', has only confirmed a deep attachment to positivist norms.[39] In this context, it is perhaps not surprising that there has been a lack of interest in the translations of current art-historical literature. Books by authors such as Hans Belting and Georges Didi-Huberman have appeared in translation in recent years, but in series published by literary theorists. What continues to attract the most interest of art historians is inventorying work, which involves large teams of researchers (*The Catalogue of Art Monuments in Poland,* or the series on Polish heritage in the East) and which contributes to the gathering of positivist 'objective facts'. This universally accepted methodology involves the analysis of historical sources, stylistic cognizance and iconographic-iconological analysis, and hence is very traditional in character. Art historians predominantly write monographic studies which are focused on either individual works of art or artists, or else artistic phenomena that have a Polish, or, at best, Central European character. Only rarely has Western European or non-European art been a subject of scholarly interest.

---

[38] Bryl, 'Czy samobójstwo', 10–11.
[39] Marek Zgórniak, ' "Dziełocentryzm" wobec faktów: O kilku interpretacjach obrazów Rodakowskiego i Mehoffera', *Folia Historiae Artium* 10 (2005) 161–71.

IN SEARCH OF NATIONAL TRADITIONS: ART HISTORY IN ROMANIA

Corina Teacă

Translated by Matthew Rampley

From the fourteenth to the nineteenth centuries the three Romanian countries—Moldavia, Wallachia and Transylvania—rarely enjoyed political stability. The constant pressures exerted by the Ottoman Empire, Moldavian uncertainty regarding Poland, and the development of Transylvania, which was eventually annexed by Austria-Hungary, accounted for the fluctuations of its borders and the history of the Romanians. Until the mid-nineteenth century the territories inhabited by Romanians were politically and culturally divided; Transylvania, culturally heterogeneous with its Hungarian and German populations, maintained close links to central Europe, whereas Moldavia and Wallachia belonged, artistically and in terms of their religion, to the post-Byzantine world, along with Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece.[1]

One can speak of a growing Turkish influence up to the eighteenth century, when Moldavia and Wallachia came under the direct control of the Ottoman Empire. The execution in 1714 of the voivode, Constantin Brâncoveanu, in Constantinople, ushered in more than a century of rule by Greek Phanariots. Complicated external relations were thus exacerbated by internal tensions caused by diverse aristocratic factions which largely contributed to the fragile social and political conditions.

In the nineteenth century, with the rise of Russia at the expense of the Ottoman Empire, the conflict between these two great powers redrew the map of South-Eastern Europe. One by one Moldavia and Wallachia fell under the tutelage of one of these powers. Following the Russo-Turkish war of 1828–29, the two Romanian principalities came under the influence of Tsarist Russia; for several decades they were ruled by Russia, as their protector and by the Ottoman Empire, as the suzerain. In spite of their weaknesses, Moldavia and Wallachia achieved their first stable union in 1859, with the help of France, followed by their definitive separation from

---

[1] On the history of Romania see Ioan Pop, *The Romanians and Romania: A Brief History* (New York, 2000).

Ottoman rule after the War of Independence of 1878. Several decades later, in the wake of the First World War, the grand union of Alba-Iulia of 1918 incorporated Transylvania into the Romanian state.

The long history of political turbulence and insecurity affected the evolution of cultural institutions. Only with the stable conditions of the nineteenth century could they be set up, and the traditional Romanian world was accordingly dissolved by the growth of Western models.[2] From the point of view of urban dwellers the introduction of Western culture had the further virtue of partly levelling out regional differences. Innovation was particularly marked in the spheres of architecture, fine art, education and fashion; in education, in particular, the imitation of the West resulted in new institutions, and even after the first universities were established on Western European lines, the intellectual and artistic elite continued to study at universities and academies abroad, above all in France, but also in Germany, Italy or Switzerland.

French, the preferred language in the sophisticated salons and in intellectual circles, maintained its dominant position until the Communist takeover after the Second World War, when Russian, introduced into the school curriculum, competed with other European languages. Despite the ideological pressure exerted by the Communist authorities in the 1950s, Russian did not attain dominance, nor did French continue to be dominant. The disappearance of the Communist regime in 1989 brought in its wake an undiscriminating openness to the West, which led to a plurality of cultures and values circulating simultaneously.

The formation of the modern Romanian state in the nineteenth century involved the reduction of the inevitable discrepancies and differences in important areas of social and cultural life. The reform of the education system and the creation of new cultural institutions, such as museums, art schools, or academies, were the index of a series of political decisions with lasting effects. Within this changing context, in which new curricula were being constantly tried out, art history was at first not a great priority in the domain of scholarship. Previous attempts to describe the evolution of the discipline have made a direct connection between its beginnings in the second half of the nineteenth century and the historical view of art, in particular, the romantic cult of the medieval past, echoes of which

---

[2] Lucian Boia, *Istorie şi mit în conştiinţa românească* (Bucharest, 1997).

sustained discourses of national identity around the turn of the century.[3] The formation of art history, itself a branch of history, came to be seen as a necessity inasmuch as the cultural heritage that confirmed the perennial existence of the nation (and, by extension, the legitimacy of the state) demanded some form of analysis, conservation and evaluation. This point of view, which may seem excessive but which was justified given the historical circumstances, led to a near total concentration on national art for decades.[4] In 1906, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the reign of King Karol I (1866–1914) this nationalist discourse reached one of its high points. The Jubilee Exhibition in 1906 was devised not only with a view to praising the virtues of a long reign, but also to defining the national character by means of its art and monuments.[5] Indeed, the initial nominee as organizer of the art section was Alexandru Tzigara-Samurcaş (1872–1952), the first Romanian art historian who, in the same year, became the director of the recently created Museum of Ethnography, National Art and Decorative and Industrial Art (from 1915, the Carol I Museum of National Art) in Bucharest.[6] The exhibition of Romanian art held nineteen years later in the Jeu de Paume in Paris in 1925, which included a catalogue essay by, amongst others, Henri Focillon, was supposed to provide evidence supporting the longevity of this identitarian notion, illustrating at the same time the relation of the past to the present in the arts.[7]

Prior to the emergence of art history there existed in the nineteenth century a didactic literature comprising popularizing, occasionally illustrated articles on art, popular biographies of artists, translations and compilations of writings with chapters on the history of art, or travel writings that described artworks and artistic monuments, such as Nicolae Filimon's *Excursions in Southern Germany* (1858) or Ion-Codru Drăguşanu's *Journeys of a Transylvanian at Home and Abroad* (1835–44).[8] Aside from such texts,

---

[3] See Vasile Drăguţ, 'Cercetări cu privire la arta medievală românească', in *Istoria ştiinţelor în România: Ştiinţa literaturii. Istoriografia de artă*, ed. Alexandru Dima and Mircea Popescu (Bucharest, 1979) 114.

[4] For a critical outline of this period and its echoes in architecture see Carmen Popescu, *Le style national roumaine: Construire une nation à travers l'architecture 1881–1945* (Rennes, 2004).

[5] On the jubilee exhibition see Shona Kallestrup, 'Romanian "National Style" and the 1906 Bucharest Jubilee Exhibition', *Journal of Design History* 15.3 (2002) 147–62.

[6] See Alexandru Tzigara-Samurcaş, *Muzeografie românească* (Bucharest, 1936) xv.

[7] *Exposition d'art roumain ancien et moderne* (Paris, 1925).

[8] Further details are provided in Carmen Gabriela Dumitrescu, 'Vechi preocupări româneşti de iniţiere în istoria artei europene', *Studii şi Cercetări de Istoria Artei* 23 (1976) 41–67.

written by dilettantes and art lovers with a primarily literary aim, moti-
vated by their initial contact with Western art, there was no specialized
literature in this field until Alexandru Odobescu (1834–1895) published his
History of Archaeology based on the first course in the archaeology and
art of Classical Antiquity and the Renaissance he held at the University of
Bucharest in 1874–75.[9] In a vast discourse touching on numerous themes
from Vitruvius to the Laocoön group, Odobescu's text was an exercise in
retrieving the most valuable elements of the past, guided by the sense of
both the ethical and aesthetic meaning of the discipline.

At the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the theme of
national identity was so wide in scope as to impact on art criticism. The
art of the past, but also that of contemporaries, such as the painter Nico-
lae Grigorescu (1838–1907), subject of the first monograph on a modern
Romanian artist, was interpreted in relation to the question of national
specificity.[10] Odobescu was adept at adopting an equivocal attitude,
remaining receptive to the role of neighbouring cultures and regions. In a
similar vein his student Alexandru Tzigara-Samurcaş, criticized the flimsi-
ness of such theories of a purely Romanian religious art.[11] The direction of
research was informed by this debate on the originality of ancient Roma-
nian art, both popular and religious, which also served to amplify vari-
ous aspects of the emergence of the first religious monuments and their
place in the sphere of architectural forms of the Balkans, or the relation
of Romanian to Byzantine culture.

In the period leading up to the First World War even Romanian mod-
ernism, which also cultivated diverse forms of nationalism, combined
openness to innovations from elsewhere in Europe with a simultane-
ous concern to offer new interpretations of tradition. Art critics, such as
Ştefan Petică (1877–1904), Theodor Cornel (1873–1911) or Tudor Arghezi
(1880–1967), whose vision was influenced by their literary tastes formed
by symbolism, were divided in their views, but commented on the frac-
tures caused by this insistence on the relation of modern art to tradition.

The founding in 1892 of the Commission for Historic Monuments (*Comi-
sia Monumentelor Istorice*), its aim being the recording of heritage and the
restoration of monuments, represented the first step in the organization
of research into medieval art. The *Bulletin of the Commission for Historic*

---

[9] Alexandru Odobescu, *Istoria Archeologiei* (Bucharest, 1877).
[10] Alexandru Vlahuţă, *Pictorul N.I. Grigorescu: Viaţa şi opera lui* (Bucharest, 1910).
[11] See Alexandru Tzigara-Samurcaş, *Arta în România I: Studii critice* (Bucharest, 1909)
5–8.

Monuments (appearing, with some interruptions, from 1908 to the present) was set up with the aim of providing reports on restoration projects, but it expanded its remit with valuable studies and articles on historic Romanian art and other related subjects. In particular, the wide-ranging perspectives of the historian Nicolae Iorga (1871–1940), who had studied in Paris and in Leipzig with Karl Lamprecht, and was the editor of the *Bulletin* and president of the Commission until 1940, had a long-term impact on Romanian historiography.[12] With the exception of work by Sorin Ulea in the 1960s, who drew on the social history of art of Arnold Hauser and Frederick Antal, or, more recently, studies by Razvan Theodorescu, who was interested in the methodology of the Annales School, Romanian art history has not been able to distance itself from its earlier traditions, with the exception of one or two minimal variations.[13]

Nicolae Iorga worked with a circle of collaborators that included George Balş (1866–1934), who collaborated with Iorga on the first history of early Romanian art and was the author of several works on the religious architecture of Moldavia, the architect Nicolae Ghika-Budeşti (1869–1943), and Ioan Ştefănescu (1886–1981), who wrote the first extensive studies of medieval art.[14] The latter focused in particular on issues of style and technique. A graduate of the School of Fine Arts and, later, the University of Bucharest, he specialized in art history, continuing his studies in Greece, Italy and France. Ştefănescu's activity as a historian was amplified by his work as a teacher (he was Chair of Art History at the School of Fine Arts between 1909–1922 and, from 1937, the University of Bucharest), and as the co-editor, with George Oprescu, of the review *Analecta*, established in 1942 at the Institute of Art History in Bucharest. The profile of this annual publication (although only four issues were published between 1943 and 1947) was marked by a new orientation towards topics in European art and art theory as well as modern and medieval Romanian art. This tendency was characteristic of the new generation of art historians who were more detached from nationalist discourse than their predecessors.

---

[12] On the influence of Iorga see Răzvan Theodorescu, 'Istoria civilizaţiei vechi a românilor şi Iorga precursorul', *Memoriile secţiei de ştiinţe istorice şi arheologie a Academiei Române* 20 (1995) 59–62.

[13] See Răzvan Theodorescu, *Bizanţ, Balcani, Occident* (Bucharest, 1974) or Theodorescu, *Civilizaţia românilor între medieval şi modern* (Bucharest, 1987), where the author emphasizes the idea of the *longue durée*.

[14] See Nicolae Iorga and George Balş, *Histoire de l'art roumain ancien* (Paris, 1922); Ion D. Ştefănescu, *L'Évolution de la peinture religieuse en Bucovine et en Moldavie depuis les origines jusqu'au XIXe siècle* (Paris, 1928).

The appointment of George Oprescu as Chair of Art History at the Uni-
versity of Bucharest in 1931 represented a turning point in the development
of the discipline. Oprescu's teaching activity, which was always linked to
his research, created the foundations for future work across a wide range
of areas. In addition to his teaching on the history of Western art Oprescu
introduced a course on modern Romanian art, although he skirted around
the avant-garde of the 1920s and the larger meanings of modernism. In
keeping with this near-linear trajectory in the history of art, the 1920s also
saw the first polemics around the role of art and its expressive forms. Rival
avant-garde publications such as *Contimpranul* (1922), *75HP* (1924), *Punct*
(1924), *UNU* (1928) or *Integral* (1925–27) had differing attitudes towards
the common question to do with art, namely, the radical rejection of
the past.[15] Recent research has questioned the innovative character and
putative radicality of the Romanian avant-garde, pointing out the eclectic
nature of its sources and the varying relations to tradition.[16]

The Communist regime that took over in 1945 appropriated the patron-
age of all aspects of cultural life. The Romanian elite at the end of the 1940s
and the following decade was thereby placed in a difficult situation, since
the revanchist gestures of the governing political class swept away, in an
instant, part of the intellectual elite. One dramatic episode that illustrated
this attack, and the inflexible situation that accompanied it, particularly
following the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, was the condemnation at the
end of the 1950s of the group around the philosopher Constantin Noica
(1909–1987). This included two art historians, Remus Niculescu and The-
odor Enescu, both of whom were the victims of show trials.[17] However,
the treatment of art historians was not uniform. The regime tolerated,
or even profited from, certain personalities such as Vasile Drăguţ, the art
critic Ion Frunzetti (1918–1985), or the critic of art and literature Petru
Comarnescu (1905–1970), who helped create the semblance of a normal
society in which various types of professionals also had a role.[18]

---

[15] See Paul Cernat, *Avangarda românească şi complexul periferiei* (Bucharest, 2007) 146.
[16] See Erwin Kessler, 'Retro-garda', and Ioana Vlasiu, 'Modernităţile picturii româneşti
interbelice', in *Culorile avangardei: Arta în România 1910–1950*, ed. Erwin Kessler (Bucha-
rest, 2007) 5–34 and 35–61.
[17] Both were subsequently rehabilitated. See Elena Niculescu, 'Remus Niculescu: Aperçu
biographique', *Revue roumaine d'histoire de l'art* 43 (2007) 7–29.
[18] On Drăguţ see the commemorative volume 'In Memoriam Vasile Drăguţ' of the *Bulet-
inul Comisei Monumentelor Istorice* (Bucharest, 2005). On Comarnescu see Monica Grosu,
Petru Comarnescu un nelinişit în secolul său (Bucharest, 2009).

During the 1950s the themes of class struggle, social inequality and the corruption characteristic of the *ancien régime* entered into art-historical discourse, imported from the Soviet Union. Art-historical texts thus became an ideological instrument, the value of which remains open to question. In its first decades, the Communist government did not give any special encouragement to the study of national heritage; instead, it supported the militant themes of Socialist dogma. Nevertheless, interest in national traditions never weakened. Under conditions of strict censorship, the language of art history and art itself inevitably became a territory of compromises or subterfuge, in which certain apparently neutral subjects served as the pretexts for the assertion of ideological perspectives.[19] For this reason, in the art-historical literature from the 1950s to the end of Communism in December 1989, there were two types of message: the properly 'historical', as it were, was accompanied by an ideological message stated with more or less intensity. Rather than being understood as a willing acceptance of Communist doctrine by their authors, such concessions have been seen, against appearances, as modalities of professional survival.

The death of the dictator Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej in 1965 ushered in a brief period of ideological liberalization, and the appearance of new directions in contemporary art, in particular the eclectic constructivism of the 1960s, enabled a progressive and visible detachment of historical discourse from the domain of ideology.[20] In addition, the demands of certain aspects of Romanian art, above all modernism and contemporary art, compelled art historians to maintain an open vision, seeking correlations with phenomena elsewhere in Europe.[21] The range of topics was further widened by the professional interests of Romanian art historians based or trained in Bucharest. The work of Victor Stoichiță (whose professional development was linked to the Nicolae Grigorescu Institute of Fine Arts, now the National University of the Arts, and the Georges Oprescu Institute of Art History) on Kandinsky and Mondrian, using structuralist methods,

---

[19] See Magda Cârneci, *Art et pouvoir en Roumanie 1945–1989* (Paris, 2007).

[20] On this development see Magda Cârneci, *Arta anilor 80: Texte despre postmodernism* (Bucharest, 1996).

[21] See Paul Constantin, *Arta 1900 în România* (Bucharest, 1972); Amelia Pavel, *Idei estetice şi arta românească la răscruce de veac* (Bucharest, 1972) and Theodor Enescu, 'Simbolismul şi pictura: Un capitol din evoluţia picturii şi a gustului artistic la sfârşitul secolului al XIX-lea şi începutul secolului al XX-lea', in *Pagini de artă modernă românească*, ed. Institutul de Istoria Artei (Bucharest, 1974) 7–57; Barbu Brezianu, *Brâncuşi în România* (Bucharest, 1974).

or Anca Oroveanu's *European Art Theory and Psychoanalysis* introduced a breath of fresh air into the scholarly domain.[22] Indeed, the recent works of Stoichiţă which explore pictorial imaginary, constitute a distinct chapter in their own right.[23]

In addition to Bucharest, a second important centre is Cluj, with its two important institutions of learning, the University (founded in 1872) and the School of Fine Arts (founded in 1926 as the University of Arts and Design). Following the creation of the Chair of Art History in 1920 at the University, the historical study of Romanian art was extended to include the monuments and artworks of the former Austro-Hungarian province of Transylvania, which had become part of Romania after the Union of 1918.[24] The appointment of Coriolan Petranu (1893–1945) to this chair in 1928 (and, later, to the Chair in the School of Fine Arts) aligned the teaching of art history at Cluj with the principles of the Vienna School. Petranu was the proponent of an eclectic approach that combined the methodologies of Josef Strzygowski and Hans Tietze, and which took into account both art's content and what he called the 'indirect' sources such as literary documents, bibliographies or topographical studies.[25]

The line of enquiry into the art of Transylvania he opened up was continued by Virgil Vătăşianu (1902–1993), Chair of Art History at the University in 1947–49 and, from 1955, Head of the Art History section of the Institute of History and Archaeology. The Institute, created in 1949, combined different research institutes in Cluj, and its principal objective was research into Romanian history, and in particular, the history of Transylvania. Its successor, the Institute of Archaeology and Art History, created in 1990, remains the second major centre of research into Romanian art alongside the Georges Oprescu Institute of Art History in Bucharest. The Review of the Institute at Cluj, *Ars Transilvaniae* (1991), currently covers

---

[22] See Victor Stoichiţă, 'Un essai d'analyse psycholinguistique des origines de l'art abstrait: Kandinsky et Mondrian', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire de l'Art* 13 (1976) 31–54; see also Stoichiţă, *Mondrian* (Bucharest, 1979); Anca Oroveanu, *Teoria europeană a artei şi psihanaliza* (Bucharest, 2000).

[23] See Victor Stoichiţă, *Image picturale et expérience visionnaire dans l'Espagne du 'Siècle d'Or'* (Paris, 1995) or *Efectul Don Quijote: Repere pentru o hermeneutică a imaginarului european* (Bucharest, 1995).

[24] This was confirmed by the Treaty of Trianon of 1920.

[25] See Coriolan Petranu, 'L'Insegnamento della storia dell arte presso l'Universita di Cluj (Romania)', in Petranu, *Ars Transsilvaniae: Etudes d'histoire de l'art transylvain / Studien zur Kunstgeschichte Siebenbürgens* (Sibiu, 1944) 453. On Petranu see Robert Born, 'The Historiography of Art in Transylvania and the Vienna School in the Interwar Period', *Centropa* 9.3 (2009) 185–96.

a much wider spectrum than its title would suggest, although its main focus of interest remains medieval and pre-modern art in Romanian territory and its interplay with European artistic currents. It is open equally to Romanian and Hungarian contributors from universities across Romania. The main, though not exclusive, focus of interest of Hungarian art historians is their own cultural heritage, and some projects have been funded by institutions in Hungary, such as the Magyar Tudományos Akadémia (the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which has supported a project dedicated to visual representations from the city of Gherla) or the Domus Hungarica Scientiarium et Artium.

However, Romanian medieval art history is not restricted to Cluj, since historians from Bucharest and Iasi have also made substantial contributions. The methods of the School of Vătăşianu have been disseminated and continued by various individuals, including the medieval historian Corina Popa, Chair of Romanian Art at the National University of Art in Bucharest, or Marius Porumb, currently director of the Institute in Cluj.[26] A particular characteristic of the department of art history of the current National University of the Arts in Bucharest (the title of this institution has changed several times, but it is the direct successor to the old School of Fine Arts created in 1864) is to have offered a wide range of subjects since the 1950s, including the theory of art. One significant benefit from the inclusion of art history within a school of fine arts (following the Russian model) has been that due to their proximity there is a direct and deep relation to contemporary artistic practice; the art criticism promoted by historians has by consequence enjoyed a certain subtlety in its interpretation of works of art.

Alongside these institutions one should also mention the recently created Art History Department within the Faculty of History at Bucharest University, which is attempting to revive the interrupted tradition of art history of the 1940s. Its educational framework follows the chronological development of European and Romanian art from Antiquity to the present, and it is influenced by a phenomenological approach that can trace its origins to France. A different direction is encouraged by the New

---

[26] See Corina Popa, 'Biserici gotice târzii din jurul Bistriţei', in *Pagini de veche artă românească*, ed. Institutul de Istoria Artei (Bucharest, 1970); Corina Popa and Ioana Iancovescu, *Mânăstirea Hurezi* (Bucharest 2009); Marius Porumb, *Icoane din Maramureş* (Cluj-Napoca, 1975); Porumb, *Un veac de pictură românească din Transilvania*: *Secolul XVIII* (Bucharest 2003); Porumb, *Ştefan cel Mare şi Transilvania: Legături culturale şi artistice moldo-transilvane în sec. XV–XVI* (Cluj-Napoca, 2004).

Europe College in Bucharest, dedicated solely to postdoctoral research in the humanities, and which has enabled interdisciplinary research in the visual arts in collaboration with the Wissenschaftskolleg in Berlin, the Getty Foundation in Los Angeles and the Central European University in Budapest.

ART HISTORY IN SERBIA, BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA AND MACEDONIA

Nenad Makuljević

One of the features of art history is its public character, as well as its cor-relation with its contemporary social situation. Throughout the politi-cally unstable and turbulent Balkan region, art-historical praxis has been shaped in accordance with the prevailing intellectual currents of the time, as well as with the contemporary social and political circumstances. This chapter focuses on the basic characteristics of the contemporary state of art history in Serbia, although it also considers Bosnia-Herzegovina and Macedonia. Without wishing to overlook important differences, art his-tory in these countries has numerous common characteristics as a result of their shared history and scientific and educational cooperation.

Frameworks

The origins of art history in Serbian culture date back to the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. At that time members of the Serbian intellectual elite in the Habsburg Empire—Austria had a significant Serbian population—adopted Enlightenment ideas regarding the central role of the arts in the development of human civili-zation.[1] At the beginning of the nineteenth century Serbia was liberated from Ottoman domination, and the emergence of the modern Serbian state, which was eventually recognized internationally at the Congress of Berlin 1878, created the conditions and the impetus for the systematic study of Serb national cultural heritage.[2] In the educational institutions of the Principality of Serbia art history was introduced as one of the courses at the Great Academy (the 'Velika Škola') in Belgrade.[3] Founded in 1863,

---

[1] Miodrag Kolarić and Nikola Kusovac, eds., *Klasicizam kod Srba IV, Štampa iz razdoblja klasicizma o umetnosti* (Belgrade, 1967).

[2] Sreten Petković, 'Istorija umetnosti kod Srba u XIX veku', *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta* 12.1 (1974) 479−97.

[3] Sonja Bogdanović, 'Počeci nastave istorije umetnosti na visokim školama u Beogradu', in *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta: 150 godina Filozofskog fakulteta*, ed. Milan Popović (Bel-grade, 1990) 101−20.

the Academy was the origin of the University of Belgrade, which was formally established in 1905.

One of the pioneers of art history in Serbia was the architect Mihailo Valtrović (1839–1915). Educated at the Polytechnic School in Karlsruhe, he was the first Professor of Archaeology at the Academy from 1881, and was also director of the Serbian Museum (later the National Museum). Amongst the various books he wrote, he published the first survey of Serbian medieval architecture in 1878.[4] Valtrović's legacy as a teacher and scholar was significant, both in authoring the first chronology of Serbian art and also in developing field work as an art-historical methodology.

Although Valtrović was publishing art-historical studies in the 1870s and 1880s, the first chair of art history was not established until 1905, when Božidar Nikolajević (1877–1947) was appointed professor in the Philosophy Faculty at the University of Belgrade.[5] The history of the chair prior to the Second World War was dominated by the activities of Vladimir Petković (1874–1956), who was also the director of the National Museum (later renamed the Art Historical Museum) from 1919.[6] Nikolajević and Petković were alumni of German universities, having studied at Heidelberg and Munich, and both Germany and Austria exerted a major influence on Serbian art history in the first half of the twentieth century.

Although the chair in Belgrade had already been set up in 1905, it was not until after the Second World War that a full Department of Art History was established at the University of Belgrade, again within the Faculty of Philosophy.[7] The other department of art history in Serbia (there are only two in total) was formed much later in 1996 at the University of Priština, in Kosovo; following the ethnic conflict of the 1990s it was transferred in 1999 to Kosovska Mitrovica, in the North of Kosovo.

After the First World War Serbia became part of the new Kingdom of the Serbs, Slovenes and Croats—later renamed Yugoslavia. In Macedonia,

---

[4] Mihailo Waltrovits, *Ο Πρόδρομος: Mittheilungen über neue Forschungen auf dem Gebiete serbischer Kirchenbaukunst* (Vienna, 1878). See, too, *Građa za istoriju umetnosti Srbije*, (Belgrade, 1874) and *Pogled na staru srpsku crkvenu arhitekturu*, (Belgrade, 1889).

[5] On the development of art history during this period see Predrag Dragojević, *Istorija umetnosti u Srbiji u prvoj polovini XX veka* (unpublished dissertation, Belgrade University, 2001) 560–5.

[6] Vladimir Petković was author of *L'art dalmate du moyen âge* (Paris, 1919) and *La Peinture serbe du Moyen Âge* (Belgrade, 1930–4).

[7] Branislav Todić, 'Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti', in *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta: 150 godina Filozofskog fakulteta*, ed. Milan Popović (Beograd, 1990) 355–66; Predrag Dragojević, 'Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti', in Rade Mihaljčić, ed., *Filozofski fakultet 1838–1998: period 1963–1998*, ed. Rade Mihaljčić (Belgrade, 1998) 361–87.

liberated from Ottoman rule in 1918 and initially a constituent province of Serbia (now an independent Republic), art-historical work was first undertaken primarily by the newly founded Skopje Scientific Society ('Skopsko učeno društvo') and at the Museum of Southern Serbia ('Muzej Južne Srbije') also in Skopje. A chair of art history was first established at the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje in 1939. Following the Second World War and the foundation of the Republic of Macedonia within Socialist Yugoslavia, the above institutions were shut down. After a gap of some 30 years the Department of Art History and Archaeology was formed at the Faculty of Philosophy of Saints Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje in the 1970s.[8] In Bosnia and Herzegovina, it was not until 2002 that the chair of art history was established in the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Sarajevo.[9]

From the very beginning of the nineteenth century Serbian art history was dedicated to the creation of a national and state identity. Nationalism strongly shaped the scientific and educational work of numerous art historians, and work on national heritage was interpreted as a patriotic activity. Great attention was primarily paid to the study of Serbian art, especially medieval—from the so-called 'Golden Age' of the Serbian nation.[10] The study of the medieval artistic heritage formed one of the main characteristics of Serbian art history.

Of course, much of the medieval heritage of Serbia and the Balkan region belonged within the Byzantine cultural sphere and an interest in the study of Byzantine art history was thus highly stimulated. However, the complex cultural heritage of the Balkans was also shaped by Ottoman rule and its presence through many centuries; for this reason Ottoman and Islamic art was also a significant topic for Serb art historians.[11] Yugoslav ideas and the creation of Yugoslavia (1918–92) also strongly influenced the artistic scene, which extended from a concern with merely Serbia to include the broader Yugoslav visual culture. The result of this development was the creation of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade in 1965, and its programme, which focuses on collecting both Serbian and

---

[8] 'Istorijat', Filozofski fakultet Skopje, http://www.fzf.ukim.edu.mk (accessed 1 July 2010).

[9] 'Katedra za historiju/povijest umjetnosti Filozofski fakultet Sarajevo', available online at: http://www.ff.unsa.ba (accessed 1 July 2010).

[10] Nenad Makuljević, *Umetnost i nacionalna ideja u XIX veku: sistem evropske i srpske vizuelne kulture u službi nacije* (Belgrade, 2006) 10.

[11] Andrej Andrejević, *Aladža džamija u Foči* (Belgrade, 1972); Andrejević, *Islamska monumentalna umetnost XVI veka u Jugoslaviji* (Belgrade, 1984).

Yugoslav modern art. In Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia, in contrast, the work of art historians has continued to be primarily dedicated to the research of the local artistic heritage, and this has been linked to the wider project of the construction of post-Yugoslav national identity.[12]

Within the Socialist Yugoslav state after the War, there was a greater emphasis on the notion of a 'Yugoslav' art, and with a stress on the equal representation of art from the Yugoslav constitutional republics.[13] Indeed, writing in the name of the nation and the struggle for the preservation of national heritage remained a key activity for many art historians even in Socialist Yugoslavia. Consequently art historians never shared a common purpose across the individual republics of the former Socialist Yugoslavia. More specifically, the entirely different educational programmes of the governments based in Zagreb, Belgrade, Ljubljana and Skopje ensured an inertness and minimal level of mutual connectivity between art historians, while Yugoslav scientific institutions, on the level of individual republics, acted only on national grounds. Hence, many of the most significant art-historical publications and projects in Serbia, for example, have been dedicated exclusively to the topic of Serbian art.

The complex nature of Balkan artistic heritage, and its incompatibility with the canons of European art history, generated a dual perception of art history. Art history was seen, and still usually is, as divided into 'national' and 'general', in which the term 'general' denoted practices in Western Europe. This approach to art history affected the shape of traditional educational programmes, concepts in museology and state research strategies.

Art History and Public Identity

The social significance of art history as a discipline that was active in contributing to the creation of Serb national identity from the nineteenth century onwards continued to shape its social role at the end of the twentieth century. This role became significantly more important during the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia and the complex political situation

---

[12] See, for example, Ibrahim Krzović, *Arhitektura Secesije u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo, 2004), and Krzović, *Zbirka likovnih djela Bošnjaka 1988–2001* (Sarajevo, 2001).

[13] See, for example, Miodrag B. Protić, ed., *Počeci jugoslovenskog modernog slikarstva: 1900–1920* (Belgrade, 1972); Protić, ed., *Jugoslovenska skulptura: 1870–1950* (Belgrade, 1975); Protić, ed., *Jugoslovenska grafika: 1900–1950* (Belgrade, 1977); Protić, ed., *Jugoslovensko slikarstvo šeste decenije* (Belgrade, 1980).

to which it gave rise. The crisis brought about changes in curricula at the Department of Art History in Belgrade. Subjects dedicated to Yugoslav art were replaced by those focusing on Serbian art history. An exception was made only in the case of modern art, which was historically created within the framework of the Yugoslav cultural space. The crisis did not significantly enhance nationalism in scientific production, but it actualized the nationalistic public activities of certain art historians. It would be difficult to speak of an organized pressure on art historians in Serbia during the period of the regime of Slobodan Milošević, but the humanities at the University of Belgrade were certainly marginalized; hence the State supported only 'patriotic work' by art historians. The nationalist state ideology had the most significant influence on the politics of the National Museum and the Museum of Applied Art in Belgrade. A number of exhibitions held there in the early 1990s were closely connected to the Yugoslav crisis and Milošević's propaganda war.[14]

In Serbia, nationalistically grounded research activity was particularly evident in the work of Dejan Medaković (1922–2008). In addition to his influence as a scholar, he also had a very prominent wider social role, for Medaković was a member and, at one point also the President, of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (1999–2003). In his work, beginning in the 1950s, Medaković strove to highlight early modern Serbian art and culture from the realm of the former Habsburg Monarchy, with a special focus on Serbian art in Croat territories. His numerous books were thus dedicated to subjects such as Serbian Baroque art, the cultural history of the Serbs of Vienna and Trieste, or relations between the Austrian Emperor Joseph II and the Serbs.[15]

In Macedonia, a significant level of nationally oriented activity could be seen in the writings of Cvetan Grozdanov, who played a similar role to that of Dejan Medaković in Serbia. He held numerous significant public positions, including that of minister of culture in the Macedonian government (1991–2) and president of the highest scientific institution in Macedonia, the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts (2004–7). Grozdanov's early work was initially dedicated to medieval and Byzantine

---

[14] Bojana Isaković, Dinko Davidov, and Radomir Stanić, *Genocide against the Serbs: 1941–1945, 1991–1992* (Belgrade, 1992); Nikola Kusovac, *Umetnička baština Srba u zapadnoj Slavoniji: Pakrac, Lisičine, Veliki Bastaji* (Belgrade, 1993).

[15] Dejan Medaković, *Joseph II. und die Serben* (Novi Sad, 2006); Medaković, *Serben in Wien* (Novi Sad, 2001); Medaković, *Serbischer Barock: Sakrale Kunst im Donauraum* (Vienna, Cologne and Weimar, 1991).

studies, but he later oriented his interests towards the establishment of a specifically Macedonian art history.[16]

The destruction caused by the war in the territory of the former Yugoslavia resulted in the perishing of substantial quantities of cultural heritage. Art historians played a prominent role in the task of heritage preservation, a major task being the search for evidence of missing and damaged works of art. The war in Croatia had heavily endangered the Serbian ecclesiastical heritage. Previous experience from the time of the Second World War, when a great number of Serbian churches and monasteries had been burned and pillaged, meant that a range of different preventive actions were implemented. This included collecting evidence of damaged icons and devastated church objects.[17]

The Kosovo crisis had and continues to have a significant influence on the social engagement of art historians in Serbia. Due to the large number of Orthodox churches, complexes of mural paintings, and icons, the territory of Kosovo and Metochia represents one of the most significant cultural regions for art historians in Serbia. The beginning of the crisis, in the 1980s, saw the start of efforts to create an awareness of the presence and nature of the Serbian cultural heritage in this area. A number of books dedicated to Serbian art from this territory were published; one of the most significant was Gojko Subotić's *Art of Kosovo* published in English.[18] The last book on this subject edited by Alexei Lidov, a Moscow-based historian of medieval Russian, Armenian and Georgian art, appeared following the destruction and burning of a number of Serbian churches in March 2003.[19]

The military and political circumstances of the last decade of the twentieth century produced different responses among art historians. More precisely, an impetus was given to assume an active role and make substantial efforts to transcend the atmosphere of conflict. The resulting displacement of national discourse led to a heightened interest in regional identities. The most explicit examples of this new regionalism in art history are the numerous projects sponsored by the Museum of Contemporary Art

---

[16] Cvetan Grozdanov, *Ohridsko zidno slikarstvo XIV veka* (Belgrade, 1980); Grozdanov, *Portreti na svetitelite od Makedonija IX–XVIII vek* (Skopje, 1983); Grozdanov, *Umetnosta i kulturata na XIX vek vo Zapadna Makedonija, studii i prilozi* (Skopje, 2004).

[17] Dinko Davidov, Miroslav Timotijević, and Radomir Stanić, *Ratna stradanja pravoslavnih hramova u srpskim oblastima u Hrvatskoj 1991* (Belgrade, 1992).

[18] Gojko Subotić, *The Sacred Land: Art of Kosovo* (New York, 1998).

[19] Alexei Lidov, ed., *Kosovo-Christian Orthodox Heritage and Contemporary Catastrophe* (Moscow, 2007).

of the Vojvodina (the region straddling the border of Serbia and Hungary) located in Novi Sad.[20] There have also been concerted efforts to overcome the national framework in art-historical studies in Macedonia. For example, the Visual and Cultural Research Centre (VCRC), based in the School of Regional Studies of the Euro-Balkan Institute in Skopje, promotes an approach to the study of Balkan cultures and modern visual studies that explicitly avoids relying on traditional national ideologies and myths, and examines the construction of transnational identities.[21]

The changing political situation in Serbia after 2000, when Milošević fell from power, generated a convergence towards the European Union. That tendency brought about a change in the curriculum taught at the Department of Art History as well. The need for new educational programmes and up to date academic studies based on the postulates of the Bologna Declaration gave birth to a three-year project, 'Understanding the Visual Culture of the Balkans'. That project, supported by the *Tempus* programme of the European Union, was organized in cooperation with the Departments of Art History at the universities of Skopje, Athens, Ioannina and Vienna. In this regard the study of Balkan visual culture has become a scientific field that transcends national boundaries and strengthens regional unity.

Methodological Pluralism

Art-historical studies in Serbia, Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina have been marked by methodological pluralism. Only the most current methodological approaches will be discussed at this point. Iconology continues to be prominent. Svetozar Radojčić (1909–1978) played a leading role in establishing the method of iconology in the second half of the twentieth century.[22] Educated in the traditions of the Vienna School, he studied art history in Ljubljana, Vienna and Prague, and was dedicated to the study

---

[20] See, for example, Dragomir Ugren, ed., *Evropski konteksti umetnosti XX veka u Vojvodini* (Novi Sad, 2008).

[21] The website of the Institute can be found at: http://www.euba.edu.mk (accessed 1 July 2010). Alongside its postgraduate teaching programme the Institute also publishes works on history and critical social theory, including translations of authors such as Judith Butler, Luce Irigaray or Mark Mazower.

[22] Svetozar Radojčić, *Portreti srpskih vladara u srednjem veku* (Skopje, 1934); Radojčić, *Staro srpsko slikarstvo* (Belgrade, 1966); Radojčić, *Geschichte der serbischen Kunst: Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Mittelalters*, (Berlin, 1969); Radojčić, *Odabrani članci i studije 1933–1978* (Belgrade and Novi Sad, 1982).

of the Middle Ages. After the Second World War, he actively participated in the re-establishment of the Department of Art History at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, thus greatly influencing all subsequent generations. In addition to his iconographical writings, Radojčić studied Serbian medieval portraits and Serbian art under Ottoman rule. Many of the questions he raised were later the subject of study by numerous disciples and followers.[23] One particular follower was Radmila Mihailović, whose work on early modern art, inspired by Radojčić, laid the basis for the iconological approach to the study of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Serbian art.[24]

Iconological approaches retain their strongest foothold in the study of medieval art of the Byzantine cultural sphere. The most prominent iconologist in Serbian and Balkan art history, also a scholar of international influence in Byzantine studies, was Gordana Babić (1932–1993).[25] She commenced her education in Belgrade and finally obtained her doctoral degree in Paris under André Grabar, from whom she adopted the principle of so called 'dynamic iconography'.[26] Her method and approach to Byzantine art is best exemplified in her study of the fourteenth-century Church of King Milutin at the Studenica Monastery in Central Serbia.[27] Her writing is characterized by a broad knowledge of Byzantine iconography, but it is coupled with an absence of any sense of social, cultural and political contexts. Nevertheless, the iconological studies of Babić and her later achievements as professor at the Department of Art History of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade contributed crucially to the dominant position of iconology in medieval studies. The iconological method has

---

[23] Sreten Petković, *Zidno slikarstvo na području Pećke patrijaršije 1557–1614* (Novi Sad, 1965); Petković, *Srpski svetitelji u slikarstvu pravoslavnih naroda* (Novi Sad, 2007); Gojko Subotić, *Ohridska slikarska škola XV veka* (Belgrade, 1980); Branislav Todić, *Serbian Medieval Painting: The Age of King Milutin* (Belgrade, 1999); Ivan Djordjević, *Zidno slikarstvo srpske vlastele u doba Nemanjića* (Belgrade, 1994).

[24] Radmila Mihailović, *Uticaji moralizatorskih tema i školske drame na evropsku likovnu umetnost XVII i XVIII veka* (unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 1963). Publications influenced by Mihailović included Miroslav Timotijević, *Teodor Ilić Češljar (1746–1793)* (Novi Sad, 1989).

[25] Gordana Babić, *Les chapelles annexes des églises byzantines: Fonction liturgique et programmes iconographiques* (Paris, 1969); Babić, *Kraljeva crkva u Studenici* (Belgrade, 1987).

[26] See André Grabar, *Les voies de la création en iconographie chrétienne: Antiquité et Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1979).

[27] Gordana Babić, *Kraljeva crkva u Studenici* (Belgrade, 1987).

thus continued to shape the work of generations of Serbian and Macedonian historians of medieval art up to the present.[28]

The methodology of Serbian and Yugoslav art history was also influenced by its wider social situation. Yugoslav post-war Socialism was clearly distinct from the Soviet model and rejected the principles of Socialist Realism in artistic life and art history. The rejection of the Socialist-Realist approach consequently led to a different view of art itself, and to the creation of what was termed 'Socialist Aestheticism' in Serbian art history. This stance promoted the development of formalistic, impressionistic and essayistic approaches to art, which dealt with questions of style, as well as work on compiling artists' biographies and presenting historic works of art that had hitherto been unknown. This approach even made its mark in the field of medieval studies, although iconological research was still dominant in the field.

Some scholars tried to establish a distinctive 'Belgrade School' of art history that drew on these features. One of the most prominent among them was Vojislav Đurić (1925–1996). The work of Đurić, who also briefly studied with André Grabar in the 1950s, focused on the study of Byzantine and medieval Serbian art, and paid particular attention to issues of stylistic chronology, an approach that underpinned his book on Byzantine frescoes on Yugoslav territory.[29] In addition to his concern with the stylistic and chronological identification of medieval art, Đurić also combined aspects of iconography with the social history of art.

An engagement with questions of stylistic periods and the biographies of artists has also been in evidence in writings on early modern and modern art. Miodrag Jovanović, for instance, has undertaken substantial quantities of stylistic research into Serbian nineteenth-century art, although much of it based on subjective and pseudo-aesthetic concepts. His recent activity over the past two decades has focused on organizing exhibitions of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Serbian artists at the most prestigious galleries throughout Serbia, such as the National Museum in Belgrade, the

---

[28] See, for example, Miodrag Marković, *Manastir Svetog Nikite kod Skoplja, istorija i živopis* (unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2004); Dragan Vojvodić, *Idejne osnove srpske vladarske slike u srednjem veku* (unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2006); Jadranka Prolović, *Die Kirche des Heiligen Andreas an der Treska: Geschichte, Architektur und Malerei einer palaiologenzeitlichen Stiftung des serbischen Prinzen Andreaš* (Vienna, 1997); Milan Radujko, *Episkopski presto u Srbiji srednjeg veka* (unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2007); Elizabeta Dimitrova and Sašo Korunovski, *Macedonia: L'arte medievale dal IX al XV secolo* (Milan, 2006).

[29] Vojislav Djurić, *Byzantinische Fresken in Jugoslawien* (Munich, 1976).

Gallery of Matica Srpska in Novi Sad and the Gallery of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Belgrade.[30]

The two most important writers on modern and contemporary artistic practice were Lazar Trifunović and Miodrag Protić.[31] Their work was primarily oriented towards issues of stylistic chronology and topics in modern Serbian and Yugoslav art. Trifunović wrote a pioneering structural analysis of Serbian modern art and founded the Chair for Modern Art at the Belgrade Department of Art History.[32]

During the last decades of the twentieth century the field of art-historical research has been significantly enlarged and transformed. In addition to the older traditions of iconology and socialist aestheticism, the art-historical scene has come to be marked by new methodological approaches and topics. In the field of medieval art, studies began to appear on rulers' memorials and the cults of saints.[33] Across Serbia systematic work began to be undertaken on avant-garde movements, such as the group associated with the avant-garde magazine *Zenit* in the 1920.[34] In the 1990s the history of photography also became an object of interest, while the concern with twentieth-century art broadened to include Russian avant-garde movements.[35] The expansion of the range of subjects has also led to the study of film.[36]

In Serbia significant changes in art-historical methodology have taken place under the impact of Anglo-American 'New Art History', based on the idea of art history as a part of cultural studies and cultural history. The new 'culturological' approach of some art historians can be documented

---

[30] See, for example, Miodrag Jovanović, *Medju javom i med snom: srpsko slikarstvo 1830–1860* (Belgrade, 1992); Jovanović, *Djoka Jovanović 1861–1953* (Novi Sad, 2005); Jovanović, *Mihailo Milovanović* (Belgrade and Užice, 2001).

[31] Miodrag Protić, *Srpsko slikarstvo XX veka* (Belgrade, 1970).

[32] Lazar Trifunović, *Srpsko slikarstvo 1900–1950* (Belgrade, 1973).

[33] See, for example, Danica Popović, *Srpski vladarski grob u srednjem veku* (Belgrade, 1992); Popović, *Pod okriljem svetosti: kult svetih vladara i relikvija u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji* (Belgrade, 2006).

[34] Jerko Denegri, *Šezdesete: teme srpske umetnosti (1960–1970)* (Novi Sad, 1995); Denegri, *Exat 51: nove tendencije, umjetnost konstruktivnog pristupa* (Zagreb, 2000); Irina Subotić, *Likovni krug časopisa 'Zenit' (1921–1926)* (PhD Dissertation, University of Ljubljana, 1990); Subotić, *Likovni krog revije 'Zenit': 1921–1926* (Ljubljana, 1995); Milanka Todić, *Istorija srpske fotografije (1839–1940)* (Belgrade, 1993).

[35] Milanka Todić, *Istorija srpske fotografije (1839–1940)* (Belgrade, 1993). On the Russian avant-garde see Slobodan Mijušković, *Od samodovoljnosti do smrti slikarstva: umetničke teorije (i prakse) ruske avangarde* (Belgrade, 1996).

[36] Slobodan Mijušković, *Alfred Hičkok: upotreba slikarstva* (Belgrade and Cetinje, 2005).

in their contributions to volumes on the history of private life in Serbia.[37] The idea of art history as cultural history played a particularly important role in the methodological position of Miroslav Timotijević, whose work has ranged from Serbian Baroque painting to the study of private life in the Habsburg monarchy between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries.[38]

In contemporary Serbian art history the youngest generation at the Department of Art History of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade has been a pivot of substantial change, focusing on the study of visual culture and its ritual, symbolic, social, ideological and gender functions, as well as on the historiography of Serbian art.[39] Such methodological innovations have been evident not only in the published research but also in the University curriculum.

The art-historical scene in Serbia, Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina is characterized by a diffuse and dynamic situation. Today, the discipline is taught at a number of universities where methodological pluralism is the norm. Approaches vary from traditional iconological principles, which are still influential in some fields, to an embrace of 'New Art History', visual studies and histories of film and photography. In addition to those based in universities, art historians are also active in institutions for the protection of cultural heritage and in a number of museums, of both national and local character. More than a hundred art historians are employed and active researchers, publishing articles in a number of periodicals. The most important of these in Serbia and Macedonia are: *Zograf; Saopštenja*

---

[37] Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić and Danica Popović, eds., *Privatni život u srpskim zemljama srednjeg veka*, (Belgrade, 2004); Aleksandar Fotić, ed., *Privatni život kod Srba u osvit modernog doba* (Belgrade, 2005); Ana Stolić and Nenad Makuljević, eds., *Privatni život kod Srba u devetnaestom veku* (Belgrade, 2006); Milan Ristović, ed., *Privatni život kod Srba u dvadesetom veku* (Belgrade, 2007).

[38] Miroslav Timotijević, *Srpsko barokno slikarstvo* (Novi Sad, 1996); Timotijević, *Radjanje moderne privatnosti: privatni život Srba u Habzburškoj monarhiji od kraja 17. do početka 19. veka* (Belgrade, 2006).

[39] Lidija Merenik, *Ideološki modeli: srpsko slikarstvo 1945–1968* (Belgrade, 2001); Saša Brajović, *U Bogorodičinom vrtu: Bogorodica i Boka Kotorska—barokna pobožnost zapadnog hrišćanstva* (Belgrade, 2006); Nenad Makuljević, *Umetnost i nacionalna ideja u XIX veku: sistem evropske i srpske vizuelne kulture u službi nacije* (Belgrade, 2006); Jelena Erdeljan, *Ideja Jerusalima i gradovi—prestonice država pravoslavnih Slovena u poznom srednjem veku* (unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2008); Simona Čupić, *Teme i ideje modernog: Srpsko slikarstvo 1900–1941* (Novi Sad, 2006); Predrag Dragojević, *Istorija umetnosti u Srbiji u prvoj polovini XX veka* (unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2001); Aleksandar Kadijević, *Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila u srpskoj arhitekturi (sredina XIX–sredina XX veka)* (Belgrade, 1997); Ivan Stevović, *Kalenić: Bogorodičina crkva u arhitekturi poznovizantijskog sveta* (Belgrade, 2006).

Republiličkog zavoda za zaštitu spomenika kulture; Zbornik radova Narodnog muzeja; Zbornik za likovne umetnosti Matice srpske and *Kulturno nasledstvo*. In Serbia, Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, art history continues to play a prominent role in society at large, explaining the extent to which it became engaged with social and political events during the Yugoslav crisis of the 1990s. The change in the political situation since 2000, owing to a new orientation towards the European Union, means that art history will continue to be in a state of flux and development, as new currents in the discipline respond to changing external circumstances.

ART HISTORY IN SPAIN: A GENERATIONAL HISTORY

Gonzalo M. Borrás Gualis

Translated by Andrea Pinotti and Matthew Rampley

The establishment of professorial chairs in art history in Spanish universities was considerably belated in comparison with the situation in Europe. Until 1901 there were no chairs with the generic title of Theory of Literature and Art, and there was only one chair in the History of the Fine Arts ('Historia de las Bellas Artes') in the entire country, established in 1904 in the context of higher level doctoral studies at the University of Madrid, transformed later in 1913 into the Chair of Art History ('Historia del Arte'). Alongside such an institutional lag regarding the introduction of the academic discipline of art history, one also has to consider the serious cultural consequences derived from the Civil War of 1936 and the Francoist rule that followed. It was only with the introduction of art history as a specific university degree ('Licenciatura universitaria') in 1967 at the Universidad Complutense in Madrid, then extended in 1968 to the new autonomous universities of Barcelona and Madrid and, subsequently, the rest of the country—that a normalization of art history as a university 'institution' was possible.

This short survey of art history in Spain offers a general systematic outline of its development in terms of generations of scholars. In fact, a number of authors were working in this field during the nineteenth century, amongst whom one could mention Valentín Carderera (1796–1880), Pedro Madrazo (1816–1898), José Amador de los Ríos (1818–1878) and José María Quadrado (1819–1896). However, the major figure of the period was Juan Facundo Riana y Montero (1829–1901); he can be regarded as the most important forerunner of the discipline, both on account of the influence he exerted on the Free Institution of Education (Institución Libra de Enseñanza) founded in 1876, and the first generation of Spanish art historians, and also because of his personal critical contribution. Thanks to his remarkable book *The Industrial Arts in Spain*, a work published in the series of art-historical handbooks by the South Kensington Museum (later the Victoria & Albert Museum) in London, he was a true pioneer in the

subject of Spanish historiography, followed some years later by Francisco Giner de los Ríos (1839–1915).[1]

Until now there has been an adequate assessment within European historiography only of the first generation of Spanish art historians, that is, the generation including the founders of art history in Spain, which included Elías Tormo y Monzó (1869–1957) and Manuel Gómez-Moreno Martínez (1870–1970).[2] Gaya Nuño, author of the most important studies of this period, places alongside these two outstanding authors Manuel Bartolomé Cossío (1857–1935), on account of his monograph on El Greco, which made a decisive contribution to the development of cultural history.[3] Other similarly distinguished scholars could be included in the list of this first generation, especially in the field of the history of architecture, such as Vicente Lampérez y Romea (1861–1923) and José Puig y Cadafalch (1867–1956).[4]

These authors had in front of them, at the beginning of the twentieth century, a wide horizon of research, to which they devoted themselves intensively, laying the basis for the formation of art history in Spain. A first and initial task was the compilation of the *Catálogo Monumental de España* ('The Catalogue of Monuments in Spain'), which Manuel Gómez-Moreno was charged with undertaking by Juan Facundo Riaño, starting with the province of Ávila (1901) and continuing—with the support of Giner de los Ríos after Riaño's death—with the provinces of Salamanca (1903), Zamora (1904) and León (1906 and 1908). We cannot follow here the history of the *Catálogo* in detail; it is sufficient to point out that the compilation, which had begun with great impetus and drive, soon ran out of energy and slowly started to decline. Publication of the texts took considerable time; the volume on León appeared in 1925–26, that on Zamora in 1927, whereas the volume on Salamanca did not appear until 1967 and, in spite of Gómez-Moreno's longevity as a centenarian, the volume on Ávila was a posthumous work, published only in 1983.[5] At present the

---

[1] Juan Facundo Riana y Montero, *The Industrial Arts in Spain* (London, 1879); Francisco Giner de los Ríos, *Estudios sobre las artes industriales* (Madrid, 1892).

[2] Juan Antonio Gaya Nuño, *Historia de la crítica de arte en España* (Madrid, 1975); María Rosario Caballero Carrillo, *Inicios de la historia del arte en España: La Institución Libre de Enseñanza (1876–1936)* (Madrid, 2002).

[3] Manuel Bartolomé Cossío, *El Greco* (Madrid, 1908).

[4] Vicente Lampérez y Romea, *Arquitectura Civil Española de los Siglos I al XVIII* (Madrid, 1922).

[5] Manuel Gómez-Moreno, *Catálogo monumental de la provincia de Ávila* (Madrid, 2002); *Catálogo monumental de España: Provincia de Zamora* (Madrid, 1980); Gómez-Moreno,

compilation of the *Catálogo* is still incomplete, and an analogous fate was reserved for other subsequent enterprises of a lesser scope, such as the compilation of the *Inventario del patrimonio artístico y arqueológico de España* ('Inventory of Spanish Artistic and Archaeological Heritage'). In this way, since a similar situation kept perpetuating itself, what could be regarded as the historiographic virtues of the first generation of art historians slowly began to transform themselves during the twentieth century into defects and endemic pathologies of art history in Spain, which was for a long time stranded between positivism and localism.

Another fact of exceptional importance for the development of art history in Spain was the foundation of the Centre of Historical Studies ('Centro de Estudios Históricos') in Madrid in 1910, promoted by the Committee for the Development of Studies and Scientific Research ('Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas'). In the context of the Centre a section on art was established in 1912, the same year in which the Prado Museum was reorganized, and when its Board of Trustees was instituted. The triangle formed by the University of Madrid, the Centre for Historical Studies and the Prado was therefore decisive for the training of all younger scholars who, in the period between the Wars, moved from the provinces to Madrid, following an academic interest in art history.

Elías Tormo y Monzó (1869–1957) was the first professor of art history at the University of Madrid from 1904 onwards, teaching the doctoral curriculum mentioned earlier. At the same time he was director of the Art Section at the Centre for Historical Studies, where he drew up a catalogue of artists to replace that compiled by Ceán Bermúdez in 1800, and which had already been expanded thanks to the *Adiciones* of the Conde Cipriano Muñoz y Manzano in 1890–94.[6] Manuel Gómez-Moreno, who was Professor of Archaeology from 1913 onwards at the Universidad Complutense, was also director of the Archaeology section of the Centre of Historical Studies (which was located close to the artistic section) and developed a wide range of research activities and expeditions, focusing especially on Spanish-Arabic art.[7]

Catálogo monumental de España: Provincia de León (Madrid, 1979); Gómez-Moreno, *Catálogo monumental de España: Provincia de Salamanca* (Madrid, 1967).

[6] Agustín Ceán Bermúdez, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de Bellas Artes en España* (Madrid, 1800); Cipriano Muñoz y Manzano, *Adiciones al 'Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de Bellas Artes en España' de Cean Bermudez* (Madrid, 1889–94).

[7] See, for example, Manuel Gómez-Moreno, *Iglesias mozárabes: Arte español de los siglos IX a XI* (Madrid, 1919); Gómez-Moreno, *El arte románico español* (Madrid, 1934);

In 1925, still within the context of the Centre of Historical Studies and under the direction of Elías Tormo and Gómez Moreno, the journal *Archivo Español de Arte y Arqueología* was founded, the first journal specifically on art, which started publishing studies by pupils of both Tormo and Moreno, in other words, works by the second generation of Spanish art historians. The main contributions of this second generation were, on the one hand, a number of synthetic outlines and collective works on Spanish art that involved great personal effort and, on the other, a deepening of monographic themes, trying to gain a difficult balance between general and specialized studies.

As regards synthetic outlines, one outstanding work was the monumental *History of Spanish Art* in five volumes (with many revised and augmented editions) completed by the Marquis of Lozoya between 1931 and 1934, a useful reference work that was required reading for a long time.[8] The same was the case with Enrique Lafuente Ferrari's *Brief History of Spanish Painting* which, from its first edition in 1934, was constantly corrected, augmented and updated up to its fourth edition in 1953 (it was last published in 1987, posthumously, with no further modifications).[9] This text served as a clear and useful introduction to the study and appreciation of all periods of Spanish painting for many generations. In this same tradition one might also mention the monumental *History of Spanish American Art*, an immense work of investigation and synthesis, begun in 1945 by Diego Angulo Iñiguez with the collaboration, from the second volume onwards, of Enrique Marco Dorta and Mario J. Buschiazzo.[10]

This second generation of art historians attained higher levels of specialization and helped ensure the consolidation of specific areas of Spanish art history. This view is borne out by the studies by José Ferrandis Torres (1900–1948) of the ivories of Cordoba and on the sumptuary arts in general, in those by Leopoldo Torres Balbás (1888–1960) on both Islamic and Christian Spanish medieval architecture, as well as in works by Angulo

----

Gómez-Moreno, *Arte árabe español hasta el siglo XII* (Barcelona, 1951); on Moreno see Rafael González Fernández, 'Los Foriadores de la Historia Tardoantogua: Don Manuel Gómez Moreno', *Antiguidad Cristiana* 10 (1993) 667–73.

[8] Juan de Contreras y López de Ayala and Marquis of Lozoya, *Historia del arte hispánico* (Barcelona, 1931–4).

[9] Enrique Lafuente Ferrari, *Breve historia de la pintura española* (Madrid, 1934).

[10] Diego Angulo Iñiguez, Enrique Marco Dorta, and Mario J. Buschiazzo, *Historia del arte hispano-americano*, 3 vols. (Barcelona, 1945–56).

and Lafuente Ferrari, mentioned earlier, on Spanish painting of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and on Goya respectively.[11]

The character of the third generation of Spanish art historians was closely connected to the events of the Spanish Civil War (1936–39) and the resulting re-ordering of the chairs of art history at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid and the rest of the country during Franco's regime (1939–1975). At the Universidad Complutense many chairs were held by members of the second generation of art historians; Angulo transferred from Seville in 1939, José Camón Aznar (because public competitive examination had been purged) and Francisco Javier Sánchez Cantón in 1942, and the marquis de Lozoya moved from Valencia in 1947 to the chair of Spanish-American Art, while Leopoldo Torres Balbás (1888–1960), partially purged, continued to hold the Chair at the Advanced School of Architecture ('Escuela Superior de Arquitectura') in Madrid. On the other hand, after the Civil War the work of the Committee for the Development of Studies and Scientific Research was taken over by the new Higher Council of Scientific Research ('Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas', CSIC), created in 1940. The former section of Art at the Centre of Historic Studies was transformed into the Diego Velázquez Institute ('Instituto "Diego Velázquez"') at the CSIC, directed by the all-powerful Angulo, who also edited the journal *Archivo Español de Arte* which, from 1940 onwards, no longer included archaeology, which was published in the separate *Archivo Español de Arqueología*. The triangle of the University, the Diego Velázquez Institute and the Prado museum became the obligatory framework for the training and promotion of the next generation of academic art historians.

The competitive public examinations for the chairs of art history of the different Spanish universities were controlled to a large extent by the professors at the Complutense mentioned above, and members of the third generation had to accept such control, since their academic power was mainly determined by their position in the promotional hierarchy based on when they were awarded their university chair. The majority of the members of this generation continued to work following the direction and research methods of their masters, with all the strengths and disadvantages already outlined. Perhaps one of the most distinguished

---

[11] See Javier Portús y Jesusa Vega, *Cossío, Lafuente, Gaya Nuño: El descubrimiento del arte español. Tres apasionados maestros* (Nivola, 2004); Isabel Mateo Gómez, *Diego Angulo Íñiguez, historiador del arte* (Madrid, 2001).

achievements of this generation was the drive to consolidate the study of art history in the various Spanish universities outside of Madrid. This happened for example at the University of Valladolid with the arrival of Juan José Martín González, or at the University of Zaragoza with the appointment of Francisco Abbad Ríos in 1958 and Federico Torralba Soriano in 1972, or of José Manuel Pita Andrade, amongst others, who was appointed to the chair at the University of Granada in 1961.

One exceptional personality at the margins of the third generation, who was subject to severe reprisals after the civil war by Franco's regime (a circumstance that explains why he never got an academic chair through public competitive examination), was the very singular case of Juan Antonio Gaya Nuño, whose publications exercised a profound influence.[12] His academic interests far exceeded the limitations of traditional Spanish historiography, extending as far as the art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and actively practising art criticism as well as literary creation. When he was at the height of his powers, one year before his death in 1975, he published his extraordinary *History of Art Criticism in Spain*, a basic reference tool for the study of Spanish art historiography.[13] A deep change in the academic discipline of art history in Spain could be noted already some years before the death of the dictator in 1975. Among the different signs of this change, the introduction of art history as a new university degree was the most important. Its curricula were first introduced in 1967 at the Universidad Complutense and in 1968 at the new Universidades Autónomas in Madrid and Barcelona, followed by the other Spanish universities, so that the discipline succeeded in becoming a 'normal' academic institution.

Many Spanish art historians have agreed in highlighting 1972, the year when the first generation of graduates in art history completed their education, as a key moment in the positive development of Spanish art history. Amongst the most important publishing landmarks to be mentioned from that year was the Spanish translation of *Studies in Iconology* by Erwin Panofsky, with an exemplary preface by Enrique Lafuente Ferrari.[14] Others included the Spanish edition of Julián Gállego's book *Visions and Symbols*

---

[12] Nuño published widely on Spanish art and architecture, from monographs on artists such as Zurbarán and Murillo to wider histories of Spanish nineteenth and twentieth-century art, and the history of art history and criticism (see note 2 above). His collected works have recently been reissued as Antonio Gaya Nuño, *Obras Completas*, ed. Consolación Baranda, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1999–2000).

[13] Nuño, *Historia de la crítica*.

[14] Erwin Panofsky, *Estudios sobre Iconología*, trans. Bernardo Fernández (Madrid, 1972).

in Spanish Painting of the Golden Century, and the founding of the journal *Traza y Baza* (subtitled 'Hispanic Notebooks on Symbology', 'Cuadernos Hispanos de Simbología') by Santiago Sebastián.[15]

The publication by the publisher Alianza of the translation of Panofsky's classic work not only put an end to the proverbial delay in Spanish translations, but also marked a new phase in the art book market in Spain. The new publishing houses such as Alianza, Cátedra, Gustavo Gili, Xarait and Akal, which now have a large market of undergraduate art history students, replaced publishers in México, Caracas and, above all, Buenos Aires, such as Nueva Visión, Ediciones Infinito, EMECE or Poseidón, which, in previous decades, had supplied the always weak Spanish market for art books with translations.

The Spanish edition of Panofsky, *Estudios sobre Iconología*, became moreover a model edition, followed in subsequent decades by all Spanish publishing companies, in which the translated text was provided with an extensive and thorough introduction (in this case, to Panofsky the author, and to his research method, iconology). Thus foreign art historians, who had previously appeared, in most cases, as vague and vacuous references adorning bibliographies, became increasingly well known and understood. On other occasions such introductions would deal with the subject matter of the book, updating it for the present or setting it in its context.

As noted above, a further significant index of the changes in art history in 1972 was the Spanish edition of *Vision and Symbols in Spanish Painting of the Golden Age* by Julián Gállego Serrano, a book that had first been published in French under the title *Vision et symboles dans la peinture espagnole au siècle d´or* in Paris in 1968.[16] This was a synthetic version of the doctoral thesis by Gállego written under the supervision of Pierre Francastel, his professor in the sociology of art at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes. Francastel's thought and method, and above all his approach regarding the dichotomy between the autonomy of the artwork and its socio-cultural conditioning, permeated all Gállego's work, whose main thesis was that Spanish painting of the 'Golden Century' was not as 'realist' as had been claimed in the nineteenth century. This was based on investigation of the symbolic culture of the period and of the symbolic interpretation of real objects represented in paintings. This volume, remote

---

[15] Julián Gállego, *Visión y símbolos en la pintura española del siglo de oro* (Madrid, 1972).
[16] Gállego, *Visión y símbolos*.

from traditional positivistic and formalistic methods, deeply influenced all subsequent literature on the subject.

Gállego's appointment to the new Autonomous University of Madrid in 1968 was as important as the Spanish edition of his work, although he had to defend again his doctoral title obtained at the Universidad of Zaragoza with another thesis, this time at the Faculty of Law, and published with slight changes in 1976 under the title *El pintor de artesano a artista* ('The Painter: from Artisan to Artist'), another fundamental contribution to the social history of Spanish painting in the Golden Age, and a work complementary to, and inseparable from, the previous one.

It is in this context, in which Spanish art history opened up to the new research methodologies applied in the studies mentioned above, that we should also consider the founding by Santiago Sebastián López of the journal of art and literature *Traza y Baza. Cuadernos hispanos de simbología, arte y literatura*, its first issue having been published in 1972 in Palma de Mallorca, where its founder was appointed to teach (later the journal was to follow his academic journey, from Barcelona to Valencia). It is remarkable that the editorial approach of the journal, which referred both to symbology and to structuralism, was presented as a tribute to Erwin Panofsky, whose iconological studies Sebastián ardently championed, in opposition to the positivistic or formalistic methods professed by other well-established art-historical journals such as the *Archivo Español de Arte* or *Goya*.

This atmosphere of change in Spanish art history that was perceptible around 1972 crystallized during the period of the transition to democracy during the three decades from 1978 to 2008, which are outlined here only in their essentials. The institution of the new art history departments in the universities; the foundation of new journals; the establishment of the Spanish Committee for Art History ('Comité Español de Historia del Arte') and its academic conferences; a brief mention of a few contemporary art historians, selected according to the originality of their themes and methods.

The extension of the degree in art history to the majority of the Spanish universities, which began in the 1970s, entailed the decline of the former chairs and the institution of new university departments of art history. These departments represent today the new teaching and research units of the Spanish universities, for which a minimum number of trained academic staff is required, so that significant teams can be formed. As regards teaching, the new curricula of the degree in art history include new subjects, such as new artistic media (photography, cinema and other

audio-visual media), besides the musicological disciplines. As regards research in art history, the universities shoulder a huge task, the fruits of which are: doctoral dissertations, research projects, the publishing of scientific journals (especially those issued by institutions such as the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas or the Royal Academy of Fine Arts of San Fernando ('Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando').

It was this situation that underlay the importance of high quality specialized journals, which served as organs of the different university departments. In addition to those already in existence, such as the *Boletín de estudios del Seminario de Arte y Arqueología de Valladolid* and the *Cuadernos de Arte de la Universidad de Granada*, other journals have been founded in recent decades, including: *Central D'Art*, published in Barcelona since 1975; the *Boletín de Arte*, published in Malaga since 1980; *Liño*, published in Oviedo between 1980 and 1991, with a new series being issued since 2005; *Norba. Revista de Arte, Geografía e Historia*, published at the University of Extremadura (Cáceres) since 1980 and *Norba-Arte* (published since 1984); *Apotheca*, first published by the University of Córdoba in 1981; *Artigrama*, published by the University of Zaragoza since 1984; and *Imafronte*, published by the University of Murcia since 1985. Other important journals include the Seville journal *Laboratorio de Arte* (published since 1988); *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, published by the UNED since 1988;[17] *Anales de Historia del Arte*, published by the three departments of art (medieval, modern and contemporary) of the Universidad Complutense in Madrid since 1989; the *Anuario Arte* published by the Autonomous University of Madrid since 1989; *Ars Longa. Cuadernos de* Arte, published since 1990 by the University of Valencia; *Locus Amoenus*, published by the Autonomous University of Barcelona since 1995, and *Quintana* which was first published by the University of Santiago de Compostela in 2002.

The national institution that brings art historians together is the CEHA ('Comité Español de Historia del Arte', the Spanish Committee for Art History), which subscribes to CIHA, and was set up by Xavier de Salas.[18] Its first annual conference was organized in 1978 at the University of Trujillo; since the fourth conference, held at Zaragoza in 1982, it has met on a biennial basis. Each meeting of the CEHA conference is coordinated by a

---

[17] Translators' note: UNED, the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, was founded in 1972 on the model of the British Open University.

[18] Xavier de Salas was a Goya scholar and director of the Prado from 1970 to 1978. See Nigel Glendinning, 'Xavier de Salas Obituary', *Burlington Magazine* 124.955 (October 1982) 633–4.

different university department and the *Actas* (Proceedings) of the conferences, regularly published both in hard copy and in electronic format, represent a perfect mirror of the current foci and academic interests of art history in Spain.

In conclusion, amongst art historians in Spain today, a pre-eminent place is occupied by Antonio Bonet Correa; the youngest professor of the third generation mentioned above, he was appointed to the chair of art history of the University of Murcia in 1965 and in 1967 to the chair of Spanish American Art at the University of Seville. His transfer to the Universidad Complutense in Madrid in the emblematic year 1972 enabled him to exercise a decisive influence on the training of the next, fifth, generation of art historians, providing a deep impulse for new research themes, particularly those on the city and on literary sources. Equally crucial was his leading role in informing the editorial policy of the publisher Cátedra ediciones in its choice of artistic subjects, enhancing its series of Handbooks of Art.[19] Among art historians of the fourth generation, besides Julián Gállego and Santiago Sebastián, who have already been cited, one should also mention the names of Alfonso Emilio Pérez Sánchez (born 1935), director of the Museo del Prado between 1983 and 1991, and a disciple and close collaborator with his teacher Angulo (who directed the Prado between 1968 and 1971). Pérez Sánchez was considered a paradigm of the positivistic method, and an unavoidable reference for the current studies on Spanish painting during the Golden Age.[20] Other leading figures include Joaquín Yarza Luaces, who engaged in the promotion of the iconographic method, and was a specialist in sculpture and medieval manuscript illumination, and Valeriano Bozal Fernández, renowned for his research on Goya, modern taste and contemporary aesthetics.[21]

The latest generation of art historians, already trained within the framework of the new academic degree in art history, has overcome the

---

[19] Cátedra ediciones is the publisher of a series of reference handbooks on the history of art, the *Manuales arte cátedra*, covering the history of art from prehistoric times to the present. Most titles concern Spain and Latin America but the list includes translations of some titles from the *Penguin History of Art* and volumes on industrial design, applied arts, photography, and photomontage.

[20] On Pérez Sánchez see 'Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez: Historia del arte', a special issue of *Anthropos: Boletín de información y documentación* (1982). Pérez Sánchez's publications include: *La nature morte espagnole du XVIIᵉ siècle à Goya* (Fribourg, 1987); *Pintura barroca en España, 1600–1750* (Madrid, 1992).

[21] Yarza Luaces is the author of, amongst others, *Formas artísticas de lo imaginario* (Barcelona, 1987) and *Arte gótico* (Madrid, 1991). Bozal Fernández is the author of *Goya y el gusto moderno* (Madrid, 1997) and of *Francisco Goya, vida y obra*, (Madrid, 2005).

traditional historiographical limitations of localism and formalism, and devotes its efforts to contemporary art in all its problematic complexity, including art criticism. Prominent examples of this new direction include Jaime Brihuega Sierra's studies of the social history of the artistic avant-gardes in Spain, Francisco Calvo Serraller's investigations into the theory of painting in the Golden Age (as well as his work as an art critic for the newspaper *El País*) and Juan Antonio Ramírez Domínguez's research into the mass media and his brilliant reflexions on the role of art history in the present.[22]

---

[22] See Jaime Brihuega Sierra, *Las vanguardias artísticas en España (1909–1936)* (Madrid, 1981). Calvo Serraller co-curated *Spanish Painting from El Greco to Picasso: Time, Truth and History* held at the Getty Museum in Los Angeles from November 2006 to March 2007. Francisco Calvo Serraller, *Columnario: Reflexiones de un crítico de arte* (Madrid, 1998). Juan Antonio Ramírez Domínguez is the author of *Cómo escribir sobre arte y arquitectura* (Barcelona, 1996).

ART HISTORY AND THE FOUNDING OF
THE MODERN TURKISH STATE

Burcu Dogramaci

Translated by Charlotte Schoell-Glass

The Origins of Art History in Turkey

"The true leader in life is knowledge": with this sentence the founder of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, defined one of the principles of his reformist politics. The building of a landscape of universities was one of the political leadership's main concerns after the proclamation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. Its aim was the modernization of a country that had been dominated for centuries in all areas of society, its culture and the sciences, by Islam. Religious schooling institutions ('Darülfünun') were secularized immediately, and institutes and universities after the Western European model were founded in quick succession.

The establishment of art history as a discipline in Turkey was achieved in the 1940s. At that time, Turkish ministries tried to bring foreign scholars to the country to press ahead with the establishment of art history. The foundations for the development of the field had been laid early on by the Vienna art historian Josef Strzygowski (1862–1941). He had been in close contact with Istanbul already in the 1920s and 1930s.[1] In search of their own Turkish identity outside of the Ottoman culture, republican scholars in Turkey were fascinated by Strzygowski's ideas and ideologies. In his writings and lectures the art historian emphasized the importance of nation and 'race' for the production of culture. These arguments, founded on ethnicity, were in accordance with the Kemalists' sense of nationhood and their concern with superseding Islamic cultural history.[2] Strzygowski also emphasized the necessity of re-evaluating those cultures in Asia that

---

[1] Strzygowski was invited in 1932 to speak at the First Turkish History Conference under Atatürk's patronage. See *Birinci Türk Tarihi Kongresi Konferanslar-Müzakere Zabıtları* (Ankara, 1932) 160 f.

[2] See Selçuk Mülayim, 'Sanat Tarihinin Attilası Josef Strzygowski', *Sanat Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 8 (1989) 68.

previously had found only scarce attention.[3] Even today the Vienna art historian is still recognized as the Nestor of art history in Turkey who challenged the Eurocentric perspectives of his field.[4]

This explains why the Turkish ministry of education turned to Vienna in 1939 when searching for a suitable art historian to build an institute of art history at the newly founded University of Ankara.[5] This contact however was aborted in the first instance. It was only in a second attempt that Turkish authorities were able to invite a Viennese art historian to the University of Istanbul. In 1943, Ernst Diez (1878–1961) travelled to the Bosporus together with his assistant Oktay Aslanapa, who had received his doctoral degree in Vienna. Ernst Diez had been Josef Strzygowski's student and his assistant since 1911, and had undertaken numerous research trips to Asia on Strzygowski's behalf. With his surveys on the *Art of Islamic Peoples* (*Kunst der islamischen Völker*) and *Churasanic Monuments* (*Churasanische Baudenkmäler*) he opened up the geographic boundaries of Western European art history.[6] In these monographs, Diez brought to bear the methodology that had been developed by Josef Strzygowski: from the individual monument one could draw conclusions about the styles of peoples and larger global connections; objects were interpreted as part of the history of humankind. After trips to the United States where he had taught and conducted research, Diez had been teaching in Vienna since 1939 when he accepted the invitation from Turkey in 1943.

Status Nascendi in Istanbul and Ankara

A specialist of Islamic art, Ernst Diez was particularly well suited to founding the discipline in Turkey. In contrast to the profile of art history in Western Europe it was not Western European art that was central to the new institution, but the history of art in the Islamic world and specifically that of the territory of the Ottoman Empire. With scarce financial and technical means, the sixty-five-year-old art historian began to build

---

[3] See, for example, Josef Strzygowski, *Kleinasien: Ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1903).

[4] See Oktay Aslanapa, *Türkiye'de Avsturyalı Sanat Tarihçileri ve Sanatkârlar* (Istanbul, 1993) 9.

[5] See the correspondence between the ministry and Hans Sedlmayr in the archive of the Institute of Art History at the University of Vienna.

[6] Ernst Diez, *Kunst der islamischen Völker* (Berlin, 1915); Diez, *Churasanische Baudenkmäler* (Berlin, 1918).

an institute of art history in Istanbul. However, only one year later, after Turkey joined the Second World War as a combatant nation, all German citizens were interned. Diez was taken to Kırşehir in Anatolia, where he continued to work on a book on Turkish art. When published, this book became the first and foundational art history textbook. Returning from internment in 1946, Diez took up teaching Islamic and Turkish art history again in Istanbul but also taught Eastern European, Byzantine and Western art history. When his Book *Turkish Art* was published it provoked a scandal, as Diez showed the Armenian influence on Islamic art as well as drawing comparisons with Byzantine art.[7] Nationalist critics published angry and libellous articles in Turkish dailies that ultimately led to Diez's dismissal in 1949.[8]

In 1954, the art historian and student of Strzygowski, Katharina Otto-Dorn was appointed by the University of Ankara, where she held the first chair of art history and founded the new Institute. She was particularly qualified as an expert in Turkish art history, as she had spent many years in Turkey during the 1930s and 1940s. She had taken part in the excavation of the courtyard of the Hagia Sophia in Istanbul in 1937 but had also been noted for exploring far-flung regions such as Antakya and Kilikia. In contrast to Diez, this art historian from Heidelberg had no polarizing impact after her appointment to the University of Ankara but was a respected expert who contributed substantially to the recognition of Seljuk art, which had been all but forgotten for a long time. Under Otto-Dorn's direction the Institute of Art History was a participant, from 1965 onwards, in numerous excavations.[9] Such hands-on archaeological work became a part of the study of art history: during extended field-trips, assistants and students studied the historical object at the place where it had been discovered. Thus Otto-Dorn instilled in her students a sense of the discipline that had already been called for by Josef Strzygowski at the end of the

---

[7] Ernst Diez, *Türk Sanatı: Başlangıcından Günümüze Kadar* (Istanbul, 1946).

[8] See for a detailed account: Burcu Dogramaci, 'Kunstgeschichte in Istanbul. Die Begründung der Disziplin durch den Wiener Kunsthistoriker Ernst Diez', in *Kunstgeschichte im 'Dritten Reich': Theorien, Methoden, Praktiken*, ed. Ruth Heftrig, Olaf Peters, and Barbara Schellewald (Berlin, 2008) 114–33.

[9] The first excavation in Kubadabad under Katharina Otto-Dorn's direction took place in 1965; it was jointly organized with the State Museums of Turkey. See Katharina Otto-Dorn and Mehmet Önder, 'Bericht über die Grabung in Kobadabad 1965', *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 81 (1966) 170–83.

nineteenth century: the unity of archaeology and art history.[10] Otto-Dorn adapted the visual thinking of archaeology and the physical work outside of the university and the library for Turkish art history. This attitude was also adapted by other, newly founded institutes in the Republic. Many departments of art history continue to offer—in the tradition of Katharina Otto-Dorn and the Strzygowski School—excavations as part of their curriculum. A temporary symbiosis between art history and archaeology therefore occurred—in marked difference to many Western European curricula. Thus the institute founded in 1965/66 at the Ankara-Hacettepe University between 1982 and 1988 was styled 'Institute for Archaeology and Art History'.

Until her move to California in 1967, where she took a position at the University of California, Los Angeles, Otto-Dorn had educated numerous art historians, who later became themselves professors. Many of them continued to work in their mentor's field, studying Seljuk art and architecture in Anatolia. When Ernst Diez was appointed in Istanbul and Katharina Otto-Dorn in Ankara, a Turkish offshoot of the school of Strzygowski came into being. Strzygowski's students were particularly successful in Turkey because none of the Western European institutes concentrated as intensely on extra-European art as the Viennese School of Strzygowski. The students of both Diez and Otto-Dorn had been influenced as to method and the topics of their research and teaching. Those former students of the founders of art history in Turkey in their turn markedly influenced the field between the 1950s and the 1980s. Particularly important were Oktay Aslanapa, Gönül Öney and the couple Rüçhan und Mehmet Oluş Arık, who taught for decades at all the major Turkish universities. Other German-speaking art historians also deserve to be noted, such as Kurt Erdmann and Philipp Schweinfurth, who taught between 1950 and 1956 at the University of Istanbul and introduced their own specializations. While Erdmann concentrated on the art of the Turkish rug and developed this into an independent field of study, Byzantine studies were introduced by Schweinfurth and his assistant Semavi Eyice, who later taught as professor, and developed the field to be a hallmark of the art history department of the University of Istanbul.

---

[10] See Walter Höflechner und Götz Pochat, eds., *100 Jahre Kunstgeschichte an der Universität Graz. Mit einem Ausblick auf die Geschichte des Faches an den deutschsprachigen österreichischen Universitäten bis in das Jahr 1938* (Graz, 1992) 81–3.

Art History in Turkey Today

The intense debates of the first decades after the founding of the Turkish Republic about the place of Turkish art history in the contexts of both religion and territory are still influential for art history today. One example is the reception of the first monograph on the Ottoman architect Mimar Sinan, which was written by the architect Ernst Egli and published in 1954 in German.[11] The Austrian Egli had lived in Turkey since 1927 and was director of the architectural division of the Academy of Fine Arts and supervisor of educational architecture in Turkey. He developed a deep interest in the architectural history of his second homeland and wrote a critical monograph on Sinan, in which he attempted to separate speculation from fact, to verify dates of the architect's biography and works, and to distinguish buildings of certain origin from attributions. The book was never published in Turkish. In 1994, decades after its publication, Egli was acknowledged in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* as the author of the first book on Mimar Sinan in a foreign language that made Turkish art known in the West.[12] In spite of these merits, the author of the entry, the Byzantinist Semavi Eyice, criticized Egli's publication on account of its dated theories. In particular, Egli's statements on the Christian, or at least non-Turkish, origins of the architect were judged to be utterly problematic by Eyice.[13]

The reception of Egli's book about the national hero Mimar Sinan exemplifies the fundamental problems with which foreign authors were confronted. The collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the defence of Turkish territory against Western claims after the war of 1914–18 had strengthened patriotism and Turkish nationalism. Such emotions also compensated for the loss of an Ottoman and religious identity. Attempts by foreigners to write a cultural history of Turkey were thus regarded with great scepticism. And even in the 1990s, as Semavi Eyice's review shows, an erroneous or merely diverging opinion could be seen as attack against the Turkish cultural heritage.

The Byzantine church Hagia Sophia (Turkish: Aya Sofya) in Istanbul, now used as a museum, still offers potential for conflict today. The bibliography of the Byzantinist Semavi Eyice, who has dominated research on the building since the 1950s, contains a great number of entries on

---

[11] Ernst Egli, *Sinan. Ein Baumeister osmanischer Glanzzeit* (Erlenbach-Zürich, 1954).
[12] See Semavi Eyice, 'Ernst Arnold Egli', *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı-İslâm Ansiklopedisi* 10 (1994) 482.
[13] Eyice, 'Ernst Arnold Egli', 482.

the Hagia Sophia.[14] While Eyice accepted the fact that Hagia Sophia's cupolas were models for Ottoman architecture in terms of their aesthetics and technology, the Byzantinist minimizes the importance of Hagia Sophia and interprets the church as one model among many.[15] Basically, the opinion prevails in Turkey even today that the importance of the Hagia Sophia is overemphasized by Western scholarship and has sometimes been misused to denigrate Ottoman architecture. On the other hand, Turkish scholars may minimize the connections between the Hagia Sophia and classical Ottoman mosque architecture. In 1990, Aykut Köksal pointed out this problematic view of Hagia Sophia: 'Since the nineteenth century there is one topic art historians have quarrelled over. On the basis of a mistaken perspective, Western art historians construct a dependence of Ottoman architecture, seen as a mere copy, on the Hagia Sophia. On the other hand, our Turkish art historians ignore the Hagia Sophia.'[16] An especially sensitive area is the relationship between Turkish and Armenian cultural history, as the case of Ernst Diez in the 1940s made apparent. Nationalism and Turkism, propagated in the era of Atatürk, is still strong after many decades. The attitude towards Armenian culture and history is still determined by politics and that may be an obstacle for the critical art-historical assessment of the topic in Turkey. Whether Turkish art historians will continue to encounter such difficulties and what they might be can only be surmised.

On the other hand, the reconstruction of a republican and genuinely Turkish history of art is to this day the main aim of the 'Resim ve Heykel Müzesi' (Museum for Painting and Sculpture) in Istanbul, opened by Atatürk, and also that of the museum Istanbul Modern, opened in 2006. There the achievements of Turkish modernism and contemporary art are on permanent display. The connectedness to Western European art is made evident there, but public collections of Western art in Istanbul do not exist, so those connections cannot be reconstructed by viewers. Although the city hosts a successful biennial exhibition of contemporary art and photography and opened the exhibition space 'Santral' in a former

---

[14] See Semavi Eyice, 'Ayasofya mozayikleri ve bunları meydana çıkartan Thomas Wittemore', *TTOK Belleteni* 113 (1951) 1–12; Eyice, 'Une nouvelle hypothèse sur une mosaïque de Sainte Sophie à Istanbul', *Actes du XII. Congrès des Etudes Byzantines* 3 (Belgrade, 1964) 99–101; Eyice, *Ayasofya*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1984); Eyice, 'Ayasofyalar', *Ayasofya Müzesi Yıllığı* 11 (1990) 1–17.

[15] Aykut Köksal, 'Söyleşi. Prof. Dr. Semavi Eyice ile', *Arredamento Dekorasyon* 14 (1990) 39.

[16] Köksal, 'Söyleşi. Prof. Dr. Semavi Eyice ile', 39.

electricity plant, awareness of international contemporary developments in the art world has only formed recently. The nomination as cultural capital in 2010 precipitated these processes: further new museums are already being planned.

A survey of Turkey's art history departments makes apparent the focal points of Turkish art history: art-historical scholarship and teaching are concerned with the analysis of Turkish cultural history and the search for the cultural roots of a Turkish identity. Overall, art history departments, in marked difference to Western Europe, are focused on the history of Islamic Turkish art. At the same time, there is a close proximity to archaeology which manifests itself in the numerous excavations directed by universities and in the fact that a substantial focus on archaeological studies is required by the curriculum. Byzantine studies are another focus, mainly at the University of Istanbul, the University of Ankara and the Ankara Hacettepe University. Comparatively few institutes offer courses on international art of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries: leading among them are again the University of Istanbul, the Hacettepe University in Ankara and above all the Mimar Sinan University in Istanbul.

The history of the discipline of art history in Turkey reaches back only sixty years. The number of periodicals is small, and there does not exist a national association of art historians. There are however two important art-historical associations—the 'Sanat Tarihçileri Derneği' (Association of Art Historians) in Istanbul and 'Anadolu Sanat Tarihçileri Derneği' (Association of Art Historians in Anatolia) in Ankara—which are used predominantly as platforms for professional communication. Meanwhile, the third and fourth generation of art historians teaches at the many state and private universities which were founded in the past decades.[17] Outside the three important centres for the education of young art historians in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir, further, smaller institutes have been founded in cities like Erzurum, Trabzon, Samsun and Edirne: the landscape of higher education in Turkey is still being developed.

---

[17] I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Filiz Yenişehirlioğlu, Ankara for pointing out to me important institutions and organizations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Compiled by Dennis Janzen

Т.А., 'По черквостроението в българската столица', *БИАД* 8, 9 and 10 (1899) 166–9.

Ackerman, James, 'A Theory of Style', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20.3 (1962) 227–37.

——, 'On Rereading "Style"', *Social Research* 45 (1978) 153–63.

Addison, Joseph, 'A Dream of Painters', *The Spectator* (5 June 1711); reprinted in *Essays by Joseph Addison* I, ed. by Sir James G. Frazer (London, 1915) 291–5.

Adomonis, Tadas and Klemensas Čerbulėnas, *Lietuvos TSR dailės ir architektūros istorija*, 1, *Nuo seniausių laikų iki 1795 metų* (Vilnius, 1987).

Agger, Ben, *Cultural Studies as Critical Theory* (London, 1992).

Agosti, Giacomo, Marisa Dalai Emiliani, Maria Elisabetta Manca, and Matteo Panzeri, eds., *Giovanni Morelli e la cultura dei conoscitori* (Bergamo, 1993).

——, *La nascita della storia dell'arte in Italia: Adolfo Venturi dal museo all'università, 1880–1940* (Venice, 1996).

Ainsworth, Maryan W., John Brealey, Egbert Haverkamp-Begeman, and Pieter Meyers, *Art and Autoradiograph: Insights into the Genesis of Paintings by Rembrandt, Van Dyck and Vermeer* (New York, 1982).

——, 'From Connoisseurship to Technical History: The Evolution of the Interdisciplinary Study of Art', *Getty Newsletter* 20.1 (2005) 4–10.

Alberro, Alexander, 'Periodising Contemporary Art', in *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, ed. Jaynie Anderson (Melbourne, 2009) 935–9.

Aleksandravičiūtė, Aleksandra, *Lietuvos Dailės Istorija* (Vilnius, 2002).

Alper, Neil and Gregory Wassal, 'Artist's Careers and their Labor Markets', in *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby (Amsterdam, 2006) 813–64.

Alpers, Svetlana, 'Style Is What You Make It': The Visual Arts once again, in *The Concept of Style*, ed. Berel Lang (Philadelphia, PA, 1979) 95–117.

——, 'The museum as a way of seeing', in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, ed. Ivan Karp and Steve Lavine (Washington DC, 1991) 25–32.

Aluve, Kalvi, *Kuressaare linnus* (Tallinn, 1980).

Åman, Anders, 'Före och efter 1970—från konsthistoria till konstvetenskap', in *8 kapitel om konsthistoriens historia i Sverige*, ed. Britt-Inger Johansson and Hans Pettersson (Stockholm, 2000) 204–20.

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, (London, rev. edn., 2006) (first published London, 1983).

Anderson, Perry, 'Components of the National Culture', *New Left Review* 50 (1968) 3–57.

Anderson, Robert G. Williams, Marjorie L. Caygill, Arthur G. MacGregor, and Luke Syson, eds., *Enlightening the British: Knowledge, Discovery and the Museum in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 2004).

Andrejević, Andrej, *Aladža džamija u Foči* (Belgrade, 1972).

——, *Islamska monumentalna umetnost XVI veka u Jugoslaviji* (Belgrade, 1984).

Andriuškevičius, Alfonsas, 'Seminonkoformistinė lietuvių tapyba: 1956–1986', *Kultūros barai* 12 (1992) 15–19.

——, *Lietuvių dailė: 1975–1995* (Vilnius, 1997).

——, ed., *Lietuvos dailės istorija* (Vilnius, 2002).

——, *Lietuvių dailė 1996–2005* (Vilnius, 2006).

Andriušytė-Žukienė, Rasa, *M.K. Čiurlionis: Tarp simbolizmo ir modernizmo* (Vilnius, 2004).

Andronikos, Manolis, Hristos Karouzos and Evgenios Matthiopoulos, 'I theoria tis "elliniko-titas" tou Marinou Kalliga', *Ta Istorika* 25.49 (2008) 331–56.

Angelov, Valentin, *Възрожденска църковна дърворезба: Семантичен анализ* (Sofia, 1986).

——, *Bulgarian Church Woodcarving 14th–19th Century* (Sofia, 2000).

——, *Самоковска възрожденска дърворезба* (Sofia, 2001).

Angulo Iñiguez, Diego, Enrique Marco Dorta, and Mario J. Buschiazzo, *Historia del arte hispano-americano*, 3 vols. (Barcelona, 1945–56).

Antal, Frederick, *Florentine Painting and its Social Background: The Bourgeois Republic before Cosimo de' Medici's Advent to Power: XIV and Early XV Centuries* (London, 1948).

Antal, Friedrich, 'Remarks on the Method of Art History', *Burlington Magazine* 91 (1949) 49–52, 72–3.

——, *Essays on Classicism and Romanticism* (London, 1966).

Araeen, Rasheed, 'Our Bauhaus, Others' Mudhouse', *The Third Text* 6 (1989) 3–16.

Arasse, Daniel, *Le détail: Pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture* (Paris, 1996).

——, *Histoire de peintures* (Paris, 2004).

Arend, Sabine, ' "Einen neuen Geist einführen…?" Das Fach Kunstgeschichte unter den Ordinarien Albert Erich Brinckmann (1931–1935) und Wilhelm Pinder (1935–1945)', in *Die Berliner Universität in der NS-Zeit, 2: Fachbereiche und Fakultäten*, ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch and Rebecca Schaarschmidt (Wiesbaden, 2005) 179–97.

Argan, Giulio Carlo, *Storia dell'arte italiana*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1968–74).

——, 'La storia dell'arte', *Storia dell'arte* I (1969) 1–2, 5–36.

Arman, Harald, *Eesti arhitektuuri ajalugu* (Tallinn, 1965).

Arnheim, Rudolf, *Visual Thinking* (Berkeley, CA, 1972).

——, 'Style as a Gestalt Problem', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 39.3 (1981) 281–9.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, eds., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (London and New York, 1995).

Ashwin, Clive, ed., *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768–1975* (London, 1975).

Ashworth, Gregory J. and Brian J. Graham, 'Heritage, Identity and Europe', *Heritage, Identity and Europe: Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 88.4 (1997) 381–88.

Ashworth, Gregory J. and John E. Tunbridge, *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict* (Chichester, 1996).

Ashworth, Gregory J., Brian J. Graham, and John E. Tunbridge, *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies* (London, 2008).

Aslanapa, Oktay, *Türkiye'de Avsturyalı Sanat Tarihçileri ve Sanatkârlar* (Istanbul, 1993).

van Asperen de Boer, Johann R.J., 'Infrared Reflectography: a Method for the Examination of Paintings', *Applied Optics* 7 (1968) 1711–14.

Assmann, Jan, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1997).

Athanasoglou, Nina, *O zografos Nikiforos Lytras* (PhD Dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1974).

Atkinson, David, 'The Heritage of Mundane Places', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, ed. Brian Graham and Peter Howard (Aldershot, 2008) 381–96.

Auerbach, Jeffrey A., *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display* (New Haven, CT, 1999).

Aumont, Jacques, *The Image*, trans. Claire Pajackowska (London, 1997).

——, 'Un film peut-il être un acte de théorie?' *Cinémas* 17.2/3 (2007) 193–211.

Avramov, Dimitar, *Естетика на модерното изкуство* (Sofia, 1969).

——, 'За движението "Родно изкуство" в българската живопис', *Проблеми на изкуството* 4 (1971) 5–27.

——, *Образуване на българската народност* (Sofia, 1971).

——, 'В търсене на национален стил. Българското изкуство на границите между две епохи', in *Проблеми на сравнителното литературознание* (Sofia, 1978) 264–321.

——, *Майстора и неговото време* (Sofia, 1989).

——, *Шарл Бодлер* (Sofia, 1985).

Baal-Teshuva, Jacob, ed., *Andy Warhol, 1928–1987: Erga apo ti sillogi Jose Mucrabi* (Athens, 1993).

Babelon, Jean-Pierre and André Chastel, *La notion de patrimoine* (Paris, 1994).

Babić, Gordana, *Les chapelles annexes des églises byzantines: Fonction liturgique et programmes iconographiques* (Paris, 1969).

——, *Kraljeva crkva u Studenici* (Belgrade, 1987).

Baca, Murtha and William Tronzo, 'Art History and the Digital World', *Art Journal* 65.4 (2006) 51–5.

Badir, Sémir and Nathalie Roelens, eds., *Visible* 3 (2008).

Bærenholdt, Jørgen, Keld Buciek, and Kristine Juul, 'Whose Heritage? Immigration and Place Narratives in Denmark', *Geografiska Annaler. Series B*, 88 (2006) 185–97.

Baetens, Jan and Hilde Van Gelder, eds., 'Hybridization', *History of Photography*, special issue, 32.1 (2007).

Bakalova, Elka, 'Society and Art in Bulgaria in the 14th century', *Byzantinobulgarica* VIII (Sofia 1986) 17–72.

——, 'Житиеписно повествование и изобразителна интерпретация', *Старобългарска литература* 25–6 (Sofia 1991) 173–87.

——, 'За ранната история на Института за изобразителни изкуства', *Journal of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences* 5–6 (1998) 3–7.

——, 'Hymnography and Iconography: Images of Hymnographers in the mural art of XII–XIII c. in Bulgaria', in *Ritual and Art: Byzantine Essays for Christopher Walter*, ed. Pamela Armstrong (London 2006) 246–73.

——, 'The Image of the Ideal Ruler in Medieval Bulgarian Literature and Art', in *Les cultes des saints guerriers et idéologie du pouvoir en Europe Centrale et orientale*, ed. Ivan Biliarski and Radu Păun (Bucharest 2007) 34–81.

——, 'King David as a Model for the Christian Ruler: Some Visual Sources', in *Biblical Models of Power and Law/Modeles bibliques du pouvoir et de la loi*, ed. Ivan Biliarski and Radu Păun (Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Brussels, New York, Oxford and Vienna, 2008) 93–133.

——, 'Principles of Visualization of the Pseudo-Canonical Texts in the Art of the Byzantine Commonwealth', *Biblia Slavorum Apocryphorum: Novum Testamentum. Materiały z Międzynarodowej Konferencji Naukowej* (Łódź, 2009) 167–89.

Bakoš, Ján, *Dejiny a koncepcie stredovekého umenia na Slovensku: explikácia na gotickom nástennom maliarstve* (Bratislava, 1984).

——, *Situácia dejepisu umenia na Slovensku: Prolegomena* (Bratislava, 1984).

——, *Periféria a symbolický skok* (Bratislava, 2000).

——, 'From Universalism to Nationalism: Transformation of Vienna School Ideas in Central Europe', in *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der nationale Diskurs*, ed. Robert Born, Alena Janatková, and Adam S. Labuda (Berlin, 2004) 79–101.

Bal, Mieke, 'Visual Essentialism and the Object of Visual Culture', *Journal of Visual Culture* 2.1 (2003) 5–32.

Balkema, Annette W. and Henk Slager, eds., *Artistic Research* (Amsterdam and New York, 2004).

Ballé, Catherine and Dominique Poulot, *Musées en Europe: Une mutation inachevée* (Paris, 2004).

Baltrušaitis, Jurgis, *Visuotinė meno istorija*, 2 vols. (Kaunas, 1934–39).

Bałus, Wojciech, *Krakau zwischen Traditionen und Wegen in die Moderne: Zur Geschichte der Architektur und der öffentlichen Grünanlagen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2003).

—— 'Historia sztuki wobec nauk historycznych', in *Dzieło sztuki: źródło ikonograficzne, czy coś więcej?*, ed. Marcin Fabiański (Warsaw, 2005) 37–40.

Bann, Stephen, 'The History of Art History in Britain: A Critical Context for Recent Developments and Debates', in *History and Historians in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Peter Burke (Oxford, 2002) 205–29.

Barocchi, Paola, 'Storiografia e collezionismo dal Vasari al Lanzi', *Storia dell'arte italiana*
    I.2 (Turin, 1979) 3–82.
Barthes, Roland, *Mythologies* (Paris, 1957).
——, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans. Richard Howard (London, 1993).
Barzman, Karen-Edis, 'Feminists, Postmodernism, and the History of Art', *The Journal of
    Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 52.3 (1994) 327–39.
Bataille, Georges, *The Cradle of Humanity: Prehistoric Art and Culture*, trans. Michelle and
    Stuart Kendall (New York, 2005).
Bätschmann, Oskar, *Einführung in die kunstgeschichtliche Hermeneutik: Die Auslegung von
    Bildern* (Darmstadt, 1984).
Baudouin, Frans and Roger A. d'Hulst, Foreword to *Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard I:
    The Ceiling Paintings for the Jesuit Church in Antwerp*, ed. John Rupert Martin (London
    and New York, 1968) vii–xiv.
Baudrillard, Jean, *Screened Out*, trans. Chris Turner (London, 2002).
Bauerová, Zuzana, 'A Critical Reflection on Czechoslovak Conservation-Restoration,
    its Theory and Methodological Approach', in *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas, and
    Uncomfortable Truths*, ed. Alison Richmond and Alison Bracker (London, 2009) 113–24.
Baumol, William and William Bowen, *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma* (New York,
    1966).
Baumol, William, 'Unnatural Values: or Art Investment as a Floating Crap Game', *American
    Economic Review* 76 (1986) 10–14.
Baumol, William and Hilda Baumol, 'On the Economics of Musical Composition in Mozart's
    Vienna', *Journal of Cultural Economics* 18 (1994) 171–98.
Baxandall, Michael, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-century Italy: A Primer in the Social
    History of Pictorial Style* (Oxford, 1972).
Bayard, Marc, ed., *L'histoire de l'art et le comparatisme*: *Les horizons du détour* (Paris, 2007).
Bayart, Denis and Pierre-Jean Benghozi, *Le tournant commercial des musées en France et à
    l'étranger* (Paris, 1993).
Baydar, Gülsüm, 'Teaching Architectural History in Turkey and Greece: The Burden of
    the Mosque and the Temple', *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 62.1
    (2003) 84–91.
Bazin, Germain, *The Museum Age*, trans. Jane van Nuis Cahill (New York, 1967).
——, *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art de Vasari à nos jours* (Paris, 1986).
Beardsley, Monroe C., 'Is Art Essentially Institutional?' in *Culture and Art*, ed. Lars Aagaard-
    Mogensen (Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1976) 194–209.
Beck, Herbert and Peter C. Bol, eds., *Polyklet: Der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik.* Exhibi-
    tion catalogue Liebighaus, Museum alter Plastik Frankfurt am Main (Mainz, 1990).
Beck, Ulrich, and Edgar Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe* (Cambridge, 2007).
——, *Das kosmopolitische Europa* (Frankfurt am Main, 2007).
Beck, Ulrich, *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, trans. Ciaran Cronin (Cambridge, 2006).
——, 'Nation-state Politics Can Only Fail the Problems of the Modern World', *Guardian*,
    January 15, 2008.
Becker, Howard, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley, CA, 1982).
Beech, Dave and John Roberts, eds., *The Philistine Controversy* (London, 2002).
Bell, Clive, *Art* (New York, 1914).
Belting, Hans, *Das Bild und sein Publikum im Mittelalter: Form und Funktion früher Bild-
    tafeln der Passion* (Berlin, 1981).
——, *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte?* (Munich, 1984).
——, 'La fin d'une tradition?' *Revue de l'art* 69 (1985) 4–12.
——, *L'histoire de l'art est-elle finie?*, trans. Jean-François Poirier and Yves Michaud (Nîmes,
    1989).
——, *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (Munich, 1990).
——, *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte: Eine Revision nach zehn Jahren* (Munich, 1995).
——, *Das Unsichtbare Meisterwerk: Die modernen Mythen der Kunst* (Munich, 1998).

——, *The Germans and their Art: A Troublesome Relationship*, trans. Scott Kleager (London and New Haven, CT, 1998).

——, *Bild-Anthropologie: Entwürfe für eine Bildwissenschaft* (Munich, 2001).

——, 'L'histoire de l'art au tournant', in *L'art et la culture*, ed. Yves Michaud (Paris, 2002) 9–25.

——, *Art History after Modernism*, trans. Caroline Saltzwedel, Mitch Cohen, and Kenneth Northcott (Chicago, IL, 2003).

——, *Pour une anthropologie des images*, trans. Jean Torrent (Paris, 2004).

——, 'Blickwechsel mit Bildern: Die Bildfrage als Körperfrage', in *Bilderfragen: Die Bildwissenschaften im Aufbruch*, ed. Hans Belting (Munich, 2007) 49–75.

——, 'Die Herausforderung der Bilder: Ein Plädoyer und eine Einführung', in *Bilderfragen: Die Bildwissenschaften im Aufbruch*, ed. Hans Belting (Munich, 2007) 11–23.

——, 'Contemporary Art as Global Art: A Critical Estimate', in *The Global Art World: Audiences, Markets, and Museums*, ed. Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg (Ostfildern, 2009) 38–73.

Belting, Hans, Heinrich Dilly, Wolfgang Kemp, Willibald Sauerländer, and Martin Warnke, eds., *Kunstgeschichte: Eine Einführung* (Berlin, 1986; 7th edn Berlin, 2008).

Bencivenni, Mario, Riccardo Dalla Negra, and Paola Grifoni, *Monumenti e istituzioni*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1987–92).

Benesch, Otto, *Collected Writings*, ed. Eva Benesch (London, 1970–73).

Benhamou, Françoise, *L'économie de la culture* (Paris, 2003).

Benhamou, Françoise and Victor Ginsburgh, 'Copies of Artworks: The Case of Paintings and Prints', in *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby (Amsterdam, 2006) 253–84.

Benjamin, Walter, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproducibility', in Benjamin, *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn, ed. Hannah Arendt (London, 1970) 219–54.

——, 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version', in Benjamin, *Selected Writings 3 (1935–1938)*, ed. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings (Cambridge, MA, 2002) 101–34.

Bennett, Tony, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory and Politics* (London, 1995).

——, 'Civic Laboratories', *Cultural Studies* 19.5 (2005) 521–47.

Berenson, Bernard, Foreword to Daniel V. Thompson, *The Materials and Techniques of Medieval Painting* (London, 1956) (first published 1936).

——, *Rudiments of Connoisseurship: Study and Criticism of Italian Art* (New York, 1962) (first published 1902).

Berenson, Bernard and Roberto Longhi, *Lettere e scartafacci, 1912–1957*, ed. Cesare Garboli and Cristina Montagnani (Milan, 1993).

Berger, John, *Ways of Seeing* (Harmondsworth, 1972).

Bergmans, Paul, Introduction to *Mélanges Hulin de Loo*, ed. Librairie Nationale d'Art et d'Histoire (Brussels and Paris, 1931).

Bergonzi, Louis and Julia Smith, *Effects of Arts Education on Participation in the Arts* (Santa Ana, CA, 1996).

Bernstein, Boris, *Kunstiteadus ja kunstikultuur* (Tallinn, 1990).

Bernstein, Jay M., *The Fate of Art: Aesthetic Alienation from Kant to Derrida and Adorno* (University Park, PA, 1992).

Bertrand-Dorléac, Laurence, *L'art de la défaite 1940–1944* (Paris, 1993).

——, 'L'histoire de l'art et les cannibales', *Vingtième siècle* 45 (1995) 99–108.

Besançon, Alain, *The Forbidden Image: An Intellectual History of Iconoclasm*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Chicago, IL, 2001).

Beuthner, Michael, Joachim Buttler, Sandra Fröhlich, Irene Neverla, and Stephan A. Weichert, eds., *Bilder des Terrors—Terror der Bilder? Krisenberichterstattung am und nach dem 11. September* (Cologne, 2003).

Bhabha, Homi, *The Location of Culture* (London, 1994).

Białostocki, Jan, 'Das Modusproblem in den bildenden Künsten', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 24.2 (1961) 128–41.

——, *Stil und Ikonographie* (Dresden, 1966).

——, 'Mannerism and Vernacular in Polish Art', in *Walter Friedlaender zum 90. Geburstag: Eine Festgabe seiner europäischen Schüler, Freunde und Verehrer*, ed. Georg Kauffmann and Willibald Sauerländer (Berlin, 1967) 69–74.

——, *Historia sztuki wśród nauk humanistycznych* (Wrocław, 1980).

Bikas, Panayiotis, 'O theoritikos kai kritikos logos tou Dimitriou Evangelidi', in *I istoria tis tehnis stin Ellada*, ed. Evgenios Matthiopoulos and Nicos Hadjinicolaou (Herakleion, 2003) 189–206.

Bindman, David and Chris Stephens, eds., *The History of British Art* (London, 2008).

Bird, Jon, Barry Curtis, Melinda Mash, Tim Putnam, George Robertson, Sally Stafford, and Lisa Tickner, eds., *The Block Reader in Visual Culture* (London, 1996).

Bisanz, Elize, *Die Überwindung des Ikonischen: Kulturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven der Bildwissenschaft* (Bielefeld, 2010).

Blaug, Mark, ed., *The Economics of the Arts: Selected Readings* (London, 1976).

Bloom, Harold, *The Western Canon: The Books and the School of the Ages* (New York, 1994).

Boehm, Gottfried, ed., *Was ist ein Bild?* (Munich, 1994).

Boehm, Gottfried and Sebastian Egenhofer, eds., *Zeigen: Die Rhetorik des Sichtbaren* (Munich, 2010).

Boime, Albert, *The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1971).

Bollati, Giulio and Paolo Fossati, eds., *Storia dell'arte italiana*, 12 vols. (Turin, 1979–83).

Bologna, Ferdinando, 'I metodi di studio dell'arte italiana e il problema metodologico oggi' in *Storia dell'arte italiana* I.1, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin, 1979) 163–282.

——, *La coscienza storica dell'arte in Italia*, coll. *Storia dell'arte in Italia* (Turin, 1982).

Antoniewicz, Jan Bołoz, 'Historya, filologia i historya sztuki', *Eos* 3 (1897) 129–60.

Bomford, David, Jill Dunkerton, Dillian Gordon, Ashok Roy, and Jo Kirby, *Art in the Making: Italian Painting before 1400* (London, 1989).

Bomford, David, Introduction to *Looking through Paintings: The Study of Painting Techniques and Materials in Support of Art Historical Research*, ed. Erma Hermens, Annemiek Ouwerkerk, and Nicola Costaras (London and Baarn, 1998) 9–12.

——, ed., Rachel Billinge, Lorne Campbell, Jill Dunkerton, Susan Foister, Jo Kirby, Carol Plazzotta, Ashok Roy, and Marika Spring, *Art in the Making: Underdrawings in Renaissance Paintings* (London, 2002).

—— 'The Conservator as Narrator: Changing Perspectives in the Conservation of Paintings', in *Personal Viewpoints: Thoughts about Paintings Conservation*, ed. Mark Leonard (Los Angeles, 2004) 1–12.

Bomford, David, Jo Kirby, Ashok Roy, Axel Rüger, and Raymond White, *Art in the Making: Rembrandt*, (London, 2nd edn., 2007).

Böhme, Gernot, *Theorie des Bildes* (Munich, 1999).

Boia, Lucian, *Istorie şi mit în conştiinţa românească* (Bucharest, 1997).

Bois, Yve-Alain and Rosalind E. Krauss, *Formless: A User's Guide* (New York, 1997).

Bois, Yve-Alain, Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, Hal Foster, and Rosalind Krauss, *Art Since 1900: Modernism, Antimodernism and Postmodernism* (London, 2004).

Bolter, Jay David and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge, MA, 1999).

Bonne, Jean-Claude, 'Art et image', in *Une école pour les sciences sociales*, ed. Jacques Revel and Nathan Watchel (Paris, 1996) 353–65.

Bonnet, Anne-Marie, 'Kunstgeschichte Museum Gegenwart', in *Kunstgeschichte & Gegenwartskunst: Vom Nutzen & Nachteil der Zeitgenossenschaft*, ed. Verena Krieger (Cologne, 2008) 181–91.

Bordini, Silvia, *Arte elettronica* (Florence, 2004).

Borgatti, Jean M. and Richard Brilliant, *Likeness and Beyond: Portraits from Africa and the World* (New York, 1990).

Born, Robert, Alena Janatková, and Adam S. Labuda, eds., *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der nationale Diskurs* (Berlin, 2003).

Born, Robert, 'The Historiography of Art in Transylvania and the Vienna School in the Interwar Period', *Centropa* 9.3 (2009) 185–96.

Borrás Gualis, Gonzalo M, *Cómo y qué investigar en historia del arte* (Barcelona, 2001).

Boshkov, Atanas and Asen Vasiliev, *Художественото наследство на манастира Зограф* (Sofia, 1981).

Boshkov, Atanas, *Българската историческа живопис, т.I–II* (Sofia, 1972–78).

——, *Българската икона* (Sofia, 1984).

——, *Изображенията на Кирил и Методий през вековете* (Sofia, 1987).

——, *Български приноси в европейската цивилизация* (Sofia, 1994).

Bouillon, Jean-Paul, Paul-Louis Rinuy, and Antoine Baudin, *L'art du XXᵉ siècle, 1900–1939* (Paris, 1996).

Bouillon, Jean-Paul, 'Review of *Les Réalismes 1919–1939*, Exhibition at the Centre national d'art et de culture Georges-Pompidou', in *Universalia 1982: Les événements, les hommes, les problèmes en 1981* (Paris, 1982) 504–7.

Boulan, Marie-Sophie, ed., *Quand les artistes font école: Vingt-quatre journées de l'Institut des hautes études en arts plastiques*, 2 vols. (Marseille and Paris, 2004).

Bourdieu, Pierre, Postface to Erwin Panofsky, *Architecture gothique et pensée scolastique* (Paris, 1967) 133–67.

——, 'Éléments d'une théorie sociologique de la perception artistique', *Revue internationale des sciences sociales* XX.4 (1968) 640–64.

——, 'Disposition esthétique et compétence artistique', *Les Temps modernes* 295 (1971) 1345–78.

——, *La distinction: Critique sociale du jugement* (Paris, 1979).

——, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (London, 1986).

——, *Photography: A Middle-brow Art*, trans. Shaun Whiteside (London, 1996).

——, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. and trans. Randal Johnson (Cambridge, 1996).

——, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. Susan Emanuel (Cambridge, 1996).

Bourdieu, Pierre, Alain Darbel, and Dominique Schnapper, *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public*, trans. Caroline Beattie and Nick Merriman (Cambridge, 1997).

Bourriaud, Nicolas, *Relational Aesthetics* (Dijon-Quetigny, 2006).

Bovero, Anna, ed., *Archivi dei Sei pittori di Torino* (Rome, 1965).

Bowness, Alan, *The Conditions of Success: How the Modern Artist Rises to Fame* (London, 1989).

Boylan, Patrick, ed., *Museums 2000: Politics, People, Professionals, and Profit* (London, 1992).

Bracht, Christian, *Kunstkommentare der sechziger Jahre: Funktionen und Fundierungsprogramm* (Weimar, 2002).

Brajović, Saša, *U Bogorodičinom vrtu: Bogorodica i Boka Kotorska—barokna pobožnost zapadnog hrišćanstva* (Belgrade, 2006).

Brandi, Cesare, *Teoria del restauro* (Roma, 1963).

Braun, Emily, 'Leonardo's Smile', in *Donatello among the Blackshirts: History and Modernity in the Visual Culture of Fascist Italy*, ed. Claudia Lazzaro and Roger J. Crum (Ithaca, NY, and London, 2005) 173–86.

Brea, José Luis, ed., *Estudios visuales: La epistemología de la visualidad en la era de la globalización* (Madrid, 2005).

Brealey, John, 'Who Needs a Conservator?', in *Training in Conservation: A Symposium on the Occasion of the Dedication of the Stephen Chan House*, ed. Norbert S. Baer (New York, 1983) 33–9, reprinted in David Bomford and Mark Leonard, eds., *Issues in the Conservation of Painting* (Los Angeles, 2004) 118–23.

Bredekamp, Horst, *Antikensehnsucht und Maschinenglauben: Die Geschichte der Kunstkammer und die Zukunft der Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin, 1993).

—— 'A Neglected Tradition? Art History as *Bildwissenschaft*', in *The Art Historian: National Traditions and Institutional Practices*, ed. Michael F. Zimmermann (London and New Haven, CT, 2003) 147–59.

——, *Darwins Korallen: Frühe Evolutionsmodelle und die Tradition der Naturgeschichte* (Berlin, 2005).

——, ed., *Visuelle Argumentationen: Die Mysterien der Repräsentation und die Berechenbarkeit der Welt* (Munich, 2005).

——, Birgit Schneider, and Vera Dünkel, eds., *Das technische Bild: Kompendium für eine Stilgeschichte wissenschaftlicher Bilder* (Berlin, 2008).

Bredekamp, Horst, 'Bildwissenschaft', in *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft: Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe*, ed. Ulrich Pfisterer (Stuttgart, 2nd edn., 2010) (first published 2003) 56–8.

Breidbach, Olaf, *Bilder des Wissens: Zur Kulturgeschichte der wissenschaftlichen Wahrnehmung* (Munich, 2005).

Bremša, Laila, Aija Brasliņa, Dainis Bruģis, Stella Pelše, and Inta Pujāte, *Latvijas mākslas vēsture* (Riga, 2003).

Bret, Jean-Noël, Michel Guérin, and Marc Jimenez, eds., *Penser l'art: Histoire de l'art et esthétique* (Paris, 2009).

Brezianu, Barbu, *Brâncuşi în România* (Bucharest, 1974).

Briend, Christian and Alice Thomine, eds., *La vie des formes: Henri Focillon et les arts* (Ghent, 2004).

Brihuega Sierra, Jaime, *Las vanguardias artísticas en España (1909–1936)* (Madrid, 1981).

Brizio, Anna Maria, *Ottocento Novecento* (Turin, 1939).

Brodersen, Kai, *Die Sieben Weltwunder: Legendäre Kunst- und Bauwerke der Antike*, (Munich, 2nd. rev. edn., 2004) (first published 1996).

Brodsky, Joyce, 'Continuity and Discontinuity in Style: A Problem in Art Historical Methodology', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 39.1 (1980) 27–37.

Brout, Nicolette, 'Le traité muséologique de Quiccheberg', in *L'extraordinaire jardin de la mémoire*, ed. François Mairesse (Morlanwelz, 2004) 69–135.

Brown, Christopher, *Making and Meaning: Rubens's Landscapes* (London, 1998).

Brubaker, Rogers, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge, 1996).

Brückle, Wolfgang and Rachel Mader, 'Zeitgenossenschaft', *kritische berichte: Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften* 35.3 (2007) 7–11.

Bryan-Wilson, Julia, 'A Curriculum of Institutional Critique', in *New Institutionalism*, ed. Jonas Ekeberg (Oslo, 2003) 89–109.

Bryl, Mariusz, 'Czy samobójstwo teorii historii sztuki? O "Bildwissenschaft", bałkanizacji, polskim kontekście i suwerenności sztuki', *Rocznik Historii Sztuki* 26 (2001) 5–29.

Bryson, Norman, *Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze* (New Haven, CT, and London, reprint, 1989) (first published 1983).

Brzyski, Anna, ed., *Partisan Canons* (Durham, NC, 2007).

Buchloh, Benjamin H.D., 'Figures of Authority, Ciphers of Regression: Notes on the Return of Representation in European Painting', *October* 16 (1981) 39–68.

——, *Formalisme et historicité: Autoritarisme et régression: Deux essais sur la production artistique dans l'Europe contemporaine* (Paris, 1982).

——, 'Conceptual Art 1962–1969: From the Aesthetics of Administration to the Critique of Institutions', *October* 55 (1990) 105–43.

——, 'Über die Avantgarde—1986: Interview mit Gerhard Richter', *Gerhard Richter*, exhibition catalogue, ed. Kaspar König (Stuttgart, 1993) 81–96.

——, *Premises: Invested Spaces in Visual Arts, Architecture, & Design from France: 1958–1998*, exhibition catalogue, ed. Guggenheim Museum SoHo (New York, 1998).

——, 'Round Table: The Present Conditions of Art Criticism', *October* 100 (Spring 2002) 200–28.

Buci-Glucksman, Christine, *Baroque Reason: The Aesthetics of Modernity*, trans. Patrick Camiller (London, 1994).

Buciek, Keld and Kristine Juul, '"We Are Here Yet We Are Not Here": The Heritage of Excluded Groups', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, ed. Brian Graham and Peter Howard (Aldershot, 2008) 105–24.

Buck, Louisa, 'Without a Trace: Tino Sehgal interviewed by Louisa Buck', *The Art Newspaper* 167 (2006).

Bucklow, Spike, 'Impossible Recipes', in *Sources and Serendipity: Testimonies of Artists' Practice: Proceedings of the Third Symposium of the Art Technological Source Research Working Group, Glasgow 2008*, ed. Erma Hermens and Joyce H. Townsend (London, 2009) 18–22.

Budd, Malcolm, *Values of Art: Pictures, Poetry, and Music* (Harmondsworth, 1995).

Buran, Dušan, Luďka Kratochvílová, and Irena Kucharová, eds., *Dejiny slovenského výtvarného umenia*: *Gotika* (Bratislava, 2003).

Burckhardt, Jacob, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. Samuel George Chetwynd Middlemore (Harmondsworth, 2004).

Burgin, Victor, *The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Postmodernity* (London, 1986).

Burke, Peter, *The Italian Renaissance: Culture and Society in Italy* (Princeton, NJ, 1986).

Burnham, Jack, Howard S. Becker, and John Walton, *Hans Haacke: Framing and being Framed* (Halifax and New York, 1975).

Burroughs, Alan, *Art Criticism from a Laboratory* (Boston, MA, 1938).

Buruma, Ian, *Murder in Amsterdam: The Death of Theo Van Gogh and the Limits of Tolerance* (London, 2006).

Busa, Roberto A., 'Foreword: Perspectives on the Digital Humanities', in *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, ed. Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth (Oxford, 2004) xvi–xxi.

Busch, Werner, Katharina Krause, Karl Prümm, and Barbara Welzel, 'Kunstgeschichte an deutschen Universitäten', *Kunstchronik: Monatsschrift für Kunstwissenschaft, Museumswesen und Denkmalpflege* 57 (2004) 269–75.

Buskirk, Martha and Clara Weyergraf-Serra, eds., *The Destruction of "Tilted Arc": Documents* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1990).

Bussmann, Klaus and Florian Matzner, eds., *Hans Haacke: Bodenlos* (Stuttgart, 1993).

Bydler, Charlotte, *The Global Art World Inc.: On the Globalization of Contemporary Art* (Uppsala, 2004).

Bydžovská, Lenka, Vojtěch Lahoda, and Karel Srp, *Dějiny Českého Výtvarného Umění, 1890–1938* (Prague, 1998).

Caballero Carrillo, María Rosario, *Inicios de la historia del arte en España: La Institución Libre de Enseñanza (1876–1936)* (Madrid, 2002).

Calotychos, Vangelis, ed., *Cyprus and its People: Nation, Identity, and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955–1997* (Boulder, CO, 1998).

Calvesi, Maurizio, *Le due avanguardie: Dal futurismo alla pop art* (1966) (Rome-Bari, 1984).

Calvo Serraller, Francisco, *Columnario: Reflexiones de un crítico de arte* (Madrid, 1998).

Camille, Michael, Zeynep Celik, John Onians, Adrian Rifkin, and Christopher B. Steiner, 'Rethinking the Canon', *The Art Bulletin* 78 (1996) 198–217.

Caplan, Richard and John Feffer, eds., *Europe's New Nationalism: States and Minorities in Conflict* (Oxford, 1996).

Caraffa, Costanza, ed., *Fotografie als Instrument und Medium der Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin and Munich, 2009).

Carlyle, Lesley, 'Design, Technique and Execution: The Dichotomy between Theory and Craft in Nineteenth Century British Instruction Manuals on Oil Painting', in *Looking through Paintings: The Study of Painting Techniques and Materials in Support of Art Historical Research*, ed. Erma Hermens, Annemiek Ouwerkerk, and Nicola Costaras (London and Baarn, 1998) 19–29.

Cârneci, Magda, *Arta anilor 80: Texte despre postmodernism* (Bucharest, 1996).

——, *Art et pouvoir en Roumanie 1945–1989* (Paris, 2007).

Carrier, David, *A World Art History and Its Objects* (University Park, PA, 2008).

Carroll, Noël, 'Danto, Style, and Intention', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 53.3 (1995) 251–7.

——, ed., *Theories of Art Today* (Madison, WI, 2000).

——, *On Criticism* (New York and London, 2009).

Carter, Miranda, *Anthony Blunt: His Lives* (Basingstoke, 2001).

Cartwright, Lisa and Marita Sturken, eds., *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture* (Oxford, 2001).

Castelnuovo, Enrico and Carlo Ginzburg, 'Centro e periferia', in *Storia dell'arte italiana* I.1, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin 1979) 285–352.

Castelnuovo, Enrico, 'L'histoire sociale de l'art: un bilan provisoire', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 6 (1976) 63–75.

——, 'Per una storia sociale dell'arte I (1976) e II (1977)', in Castelnuovo, *Arte, industria, rivoluzioni: Temi di storia sociale dell'arte* (Turin, 1985) 3–64.

Castells, Manuel, *The Rise of the Network Society* (Oxford, 1996).

——, *The Power of Identity* (Oxford, 1998).

Cavalcaselle, Giovanni Battistia, 'Sulla conservazione dei monumenti ed oggetti di belle arti e sulla riforma dell'insegnamento accademico', *Rivista dei Comuni Italiani* 3.4 (1863) 33–56; 5, 25–43; 6, 33–46.

Cave, Kathryn, ed., *The Diary of Joseph Farington*, 16 vols. (London and New Haven, CT, 1978–84).

Ceán Bermúdez, Agustín, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de Bellas Artes en España* (Madrid, 1800).

Cennini, Cennino, *A Treatise on Painting*, with an Introduction and Notes by Signor Tambroni, trans. Mary Philadelphia Merrifield (London, 1844).

Centre interdisciplinaire d'études et de recherches sur l'expression contemporaine, ed., *Le Cubisme, Travaux de l'Université de Saint-Etienne* 4 (1973).

Ceran, Waldemar, 'Główne osiągnięcia polskich badań nad historią sztuki bizantyjskiej (do roku 1988)', in *Sztuka średniowiecznego Wschodu i Zachodu*, ed. Małgorzata Smorąg Różycka (Cracow, 2002) 12–39.

Cernat, Paul, *Avangarda românească şi complexul periferiei* (Bucharest, 2007).

Ceysson, Bernard, ed., *Vingt-cinq ans d'art en France: 1960–1985* (Paris, 1986).

——, 'Entretien avec J.-P. Ameline et H. Bellet', in *Manifeste: Une histoire parallèle 1960–1990*, exhibition catalogue Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris (Paris, 1993) 33–42.

Chadraba, Rudolf and Rostislav Švácha, eds., *Dějiny českého výtvarného umění*, 6 vols. (Prague, 1984–2007).

Chadraba, Rudolf, *Dürers Apokalypse: eine ikonologische Deutung* (Prague, 1964).

——, ed., *Dějiny Českého Výtvarného Umění: Od Počátků do Konce Středověku* (Prague, 1984).

Chakrabarty, Dipesh, *Provincialising Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, NJ, 2000).

Chalupecký, Jindřich, 'Marcel Duchamp: A re-evaluation', *Artibus et historiae* 6 (1985) 125–36.

——, 'Les ready-made de Duchamp et la théorie du symbole', *Artibus et historiae* 7 (1986) 153–63.

Champarnaud, Luc, Victor Ginsburgh, and Philippe Michel, 'Can Public Arts Education Replace Arts Subsidization?' *Journal of Cultural Economics* 32 (2008) 109–26.

Chaplin, Sarah and John A. Walker, *Visual Culture: An Introduction* (Manchester, 1997).

Château, Dominique, *Sémiotique et esthétique de l'image: Théorie de l'iconicité* (Paris, 2007).

Chatenet, Monique, Krista de Jonge, Ethan Matt Kavaler, and Norbert Nussbaum, 'Architecture européenne: un "gothique de la Renaissance" autour de 1500?' *Perspectives* II (2006) 280–8.

Cheetham, Mark, Michael Ann Holly, and Keith Moxey, 'Visual Studies, Historiography, and Aesthetics', *Journal of Visual Culture* 4.1 (2005) 75–90.

Chojecka, Ewa, 'Polnische "Westforschung" und das Syndrom des Eisernen Vorhangs', in *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der nationale Diskurs*, ed. Robert Born, Adam S. Labuda, and Alena Janatková (Berlin, 2004) 411–20.

Chrisafis, Angelique, 'Dante to Dialects: EU's Online Renaissance', *Guardian*, November 21, 2008.

Christensen, Hans Dam, *Forskydningens kunst: Kritiske bidrag til kunsthistoriens historie* (Copenhagen, 2001).

——, 'Hvad er kunsthistorie? Betragtninger over kulturforskningens nutid og fremtid', in *Det kunsthistoriske studieapparat: Hånd- og debatbog fra den videnskabelige hverdag*, ed. Hans Dam Christensen and Louise C. Larsen (Copenhagen, 2004) 263–86 and 303–4.

——, 'Billedkunsten: Om kunsthistorikeren N.L. Høyen og folkets billedkunst', in *Veje til danskheden: Bidrag til den moderne nationale selvforståelse*, ed. Palle Ove Christiansen (Copenhagen, 2005) 66–94.

——, 'Which Art History?' in *Is Art History Global?*, ed. James Elkins (London, 2006) 298–309.

Christensen, Hans Dam and Helene Illeris, Introduction to *Visuel kultur: Viden, Liv, Politik*, ed. Dam Christensen and Helene Illeris (Copenhagen, 2009) 9–23.

Cielava, Skaidrīte, ed., *Latviešu tēlotāja māksla 1860–1940* (Riga, 1986).

——, ed., *Materiāli feodālisma posma Latvijas mākslas vēsturei*, 4 vols. (Riga, 1986–89).

Cinelli, Barbara and Fernando Mazzocca, eds., *Fortuna visiva di Masaccio* (Florence, 1979).

——, eds., *Artisti e cultura visiva nel Novecento* (Pistoia, 1980).

Clair, Jean, 'Données d'un problème', in *Les Réalismes 1919–1939: Entre révolution et réaction*, exhibition catalogue Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris, ed. Jean Clair (Paris, 1981) 8–14.

——, 'La guerre de l'art: regards croisés sur Philippe Dagen et Yves Michaud', *Le Débat* 98 (1998) 4–12.

——, *Malaise dans les musées* (Paris, 2007).

Clark, John, *Modern Asian Art* (Honolulu, HI, 1998).

Clark, Julian and Alun Jones, 'The Spatialities of Europeanisation: Territory, Government and Power in "Europe"', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33 (2008) 300–18.

Clark, Timothy J., 'On the Social History of Art', in Clark: *The Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution* (London, 1973) 9–20.

——, 'On the Conditions of Artistic Creation', *Times Literary Supplement* (24 May 1974) 561–3.

——, 'Clement Greenberg's Theory of Art', *Critical Inquiry* 9.1, (1982) 139–56.

Clarke, Mark, Joyce H. Townsend, and Ad Stijnman, eds., *Art of the Past: Proceedings of the First Symposium of the Art Technological Source Research Study Group, Amsterdam 2004* (London, 2005).

Clarke, Mark, *The Art of All Colours: Mediaeval Recipe Books for Painters and Illuminators* (London, 2001).

——, 'Asymptotically Approaching the Past: Historiography and Critical Use of Sources in Art Technological Source Research', in *Art Technology: Sources and Methods: Proceedings of the Second Symposium of Art Technological Source Research Study Group, Madrid 2007*, ed. Stefanos Kroustallis, Joyce H. Townsend, Elena Cenalmor Bruquetas, Ad Stijnman, and Margarita San Andres Moya (London, 2008) 16–22.

Clayton, Peter and Martin Price, eds., *The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World* (London, 1988).

Coleman, Kathleen, ed., *Martial: Liber Spectaculorum* (Oxford, 2006).

Conkey, Margaret W. and Christine A. Hastorf, eds., *The Uses of Style in Archaeology* (Cambridge, 1990).

Consoli, Gian Paolo, *Il Museo Pio-Clementino: La scena dell'antico in Vaticano* (Modena, 1996).

Constantin, Paul, *Arta 1900 în România* (Bucharest, 1972).

Conti, Alessandro, 'L'evoluzione dell'artista', in *Storia dell'arte italiana* I.2, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin 1979) 117–264.

de Contreras y López de Ayala, Juan, Marquis of Lozoya, *Historia del arte hispánico*, 5 vols. (Barcelona, 1931–34).

Cope, David, *Computers and Musical Style* (Oxford, 1991).

Coremans, Paul, 'Editorial', *Bulletin de l'Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique* I (1958) 3–4.

Coremans, Paul, Jacques Lavalleye, and Herman Bouchery, *Les Primitifs flamands, III. Contributions à l'étude des Primitifs flamands, 2. L'Agneau mystique au laboratoire: Examen et traitement* (Antwerp, 1953).

Corti, Laura, ed., *CENSUS: Computerization in the History of Art* (Pisa and Los Angeles, 1984).

Costa, Mario, *L'estetica dei media: Avanguardie e tecnologia* (Rome, 1999).

Cossío, Manuel Bartolomé, *El Greco* (Madrid, 1908).

Cottington, David, *Cubism and its Histories* (Manchester and New York, 2004).

Council of Europe, *The Santiago de Compostela Pilgrimage Routes* (Strasbourg, 1989).

Courajod, Louis, *Leçons professés à l'école du Louvre (1887–1896) I: Origines de l'art roman et gothique* (Paris, 1899).

Crane, Diana, *The Transformation of the Avant-garde: The New York Art World, 1940–1985* (Chicago, 1987).

Crow, Thomas, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-century Paris* (Cambridge, 1985).

Cunningham, Colin and Gill Perry, *Academies, Museums and Canons of Art* (London and New Haven, CT, 1999).

Čupić, Simona, *Teme i ideje modernog: Srpsko slikarstvo 1900–1941* (Novi Sad, 2006).

Cutting, James E., *Impressionism and its Canon* (Lanham, MD, 2006).

Dacos, Nicole, 'Arte italiana e arte antica' in *Storia dell'arte italiana* I.3, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin 1979) 1–68.

——, 'Présentation', in *Relations artistiques entre les Pays-Bas et l'Italie à la Renaissance: Etudes dédiées à Suzanne Sulzberger* (Brussels and Rome, 1980) I–VII.

DaCosta Kaufmann, Thomas, *Court, Cloister, and City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe, 1450–1800* (Princeton, NJ, 1995).

——, 'Early Modern Ideas about Artistic Geography Regarding the Baltic Region', *Scandinavian Journal of History* 28 (2003) 263–72.

——, *Toward a Geography of Art* (Princeton, NJ, 2004).

——, 'Section: The Idea of World Art History', in *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence: The Proceedings of the 32nd International Congress in the History of Art*, ed. Jaynie Anderson (Melbourne, 2009) 72–4.

Dagron, Gilbert, 'André Grabar: 26 juillet 1896–3 octobre 1990', Annuaire College de France 1990–1991 (Paris, 1991) 91–2.

Daix, Pierre, *L'Ordre et l'Aventure: Peinture, modernité et répression totalitaire* (Paris, 1984).

D'Alleva, Anne, *Méthodes & théories de l'histoire de l'art*, trans. Aude Cirier (Paris, 2006).

Damisch, Hubert, 'Histoire et/ou théorie de l'art', *Scolies* 1 (1971) 27–36.

——, *Critique*: *Histoire, théorie de l'art*, special issue 315–16 (1973).

——, 'Sociologie de l'art', in *Encyclopædia Universalis* XXI (Paris, 1989) 227–30.

Danto, Arthur, 'The Artworld', *Journal of Philosophy* 61 (1964) 571–84.

——, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2nd printing 1983) (first published 1981).

——, 'Narrative and Style', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 49.3 (1991) 201–9.

——, *After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History* (Princeton, NJ, 1997).

Darwin, Charles, 'The Structure and Distribution of Coral Reefs', in Darwin, *The Works of Charles Darwin*, ed. Paul Barrett and Peter Gautrey (London, 1986).

Daston, Lorrain and Katharine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150–1750* (New York, 1998).

Davenport, Michael and Gerald Studdert-Kennedy, 'The Balance of Roger de Piles: A Statistical Analysis', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32 (1974) 493–502.

Davidov, Dinko, Miroslav Timotijević, and Radomir Stanić, *Ratna stradanja pravoslavnih hramova u srpskim oblastima u Hrvatskoj 1991* (Belgrade, 1992).

Davies, Norman, *Europe: A History* (Oxford, 1996).

Davies, Stephen, *Definitions of Art* (Ithaca, 1991).

Davis, Peter, *Ecomuseums: A Sense of Place* (London, 1999).

——, 'Places, "Cultural Touchstones" and the Ecomuseum', in *Heritage, Museums and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, ed. Gerard Corsane (London, 2005) 365–77.

Debord, Guy, *Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Fredy Perlman, Tony Verlaan, Paul Sieveking, Michel Prigent, Colin Carsten, and John Fullerton (Detroit, MI, 1968).

Debord, Guy, *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson Smith (New York, 1994).

Debray, Régis, *Vie et Mort de l'Image* (Paris, 1995).

Dekoninck, Ralph, Agnès Guiderdoni, and Walter Melion, eds., *Ut pictura meditatio: The Meditative Image in Northern Art, 1500–1700* (Leiden, forthcoming).

Deleuze, Gilles, *Cinema* (New York, 2001).

Deloche, Bernard, *Le musée virtuel: Vers une éthique des nouvelles images* (Paris, 2001).

De Marchi, Neil and Hans J. Van Miegroet, 'Pricing Invention: Originals, Copies and their Relative Value in Seventeenth-Century Art Markets', in *Economics of the Arts: Selected Essays*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and Pierre-Michel Menger (Amsterdam, 1996) 26–67.

——, 'The History of Art Markets', in *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby (Amsterdam, 2006) 69–123.

De Marchi, Neil, 'Auctioning Paintings in late Seventeenth-Century London', in *Economics of Art and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh (Amsterdam, 2004) 97–128.

——, 'Reluctant Partners: Aesthetic and Market Value, 1708–1871', in *Sublime Economy: On the Intersection of Art and Economics*, ed. Jack Amariglio, Stephen E. Cullenberg, and Joseph W. Childers (London, 2008) 95–111.

Denegri, Jerko, *Šezdesete: teme srpske umetnosti (1960–1970)* (Novi Sad, 1995).

——, *Exat 51: nove tendencije, umjetnost konstruktivnog pristupa* (Zagreb, 2000).

Dermody, Susan, 'The Pressure of the Unconscious upon the Image: The Subjective Voice in Documentary', in *Fields of Vision: Essays in Film Studies, Visual Anthropology and Photography*, ed. Leslie Devereaux and Roger Hillman (Berkeley, CA, 1995) 292–310.

DeRoo, Rebecca, *The Museum Establishment and Contemporary Art: The Politics of Artistic Display in France after 1968* (Cambridge, 2006).

Derrida, Jacques, *The Truth in Painting*, co-author and trans. Geoffrey Bennington (Chicago, IL, 1987).

Desai, Vishakha N., ed., *Asian Art History in the Twenty-First Century* (New Haven, CT, 2007).

Desvallées, André, ed., *Vagues: Une anthologie de la nouvelle muséologie. Recueil de textes* (Lyon, 1992 and 1994).

Devigne, Marguerite, *La sculpture mosane du XIIᵉ au XVIᵉ siècle: Contribution à l'étude de l'art dans la région de la Meuse moyenne* (Paris, 1932).

Díaz-Kommonen, Lily, *Art, Fact and Artifact Production: Design Research and Multidisciplinary Collaboration* (Helsinki, 2002).

——, 'Designing and Producing Digital Cultural Heritage: The Map of Mexico 1550', in *La Rivista di Engramma on line* 54 (2007).

Dickie, George, 'Defining Art', *American Philosophical Quarterly* 6.3 (1969) 253–6.

——, *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis* (Ithaca, NY, 1974).

——, 'The New Institutional Theory of Art', in *Aesthetics: Proceedings of the 8th International Wittgenstein Symposium*, ed. Rudolf Haller (Vienna, 1984) 57–64.

——, *The Art Circle: A Theory of Art* (Berkeley, CA, 1985).

——, *Evaluating Art* (Philadelphia, PA, 1988).

Didi-Huberman, Georges, *Devant l'image: Question posée aux fins d'une histoire de l'art* (Paris, 1990).

——, *Ce que nous voyons, ce qui nous regarde* (Paris, 1992).

——, *Fra Angelico: Dissemblance and Figuration*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Chicago, IL, 1995).

——, *Devant le temps: Histoire de l'art et anachronisme des images* (Paris, 2000).

——, *L'image survivante: Histoire de l'art et temps des fantômes selon Aby Warburg* (Paris, 2002).

——, *Invention of Hysteria: Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpetriere*, trans. Alisa Hartz (Cambridge, MA, 2004).

——, *L'image ouverte: Motifs de l'incarnation dans les arts visuels* (Paris, 2007).

——, 'En ordre dispersé', *Trivium* 1 (2008).

——, *Confronting Images: Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art*, trans. John Goodman (Philadelphia, PA, 2009).

Didi-Huberman, Georges and Bernard Stiegler, eds., *Trivium, special issue: "Iconic Turn" et réflexion societal*, 1 (2008).

Diers, Michael and Kasper König, eds., *Aufsätze und Dokumente zur Debatte um das Reichstagsprojekt von Hans Haacke 'Der Bevölkerung'* (Cologne, 2000).

Diers, Michael, *Schlagbilder: Zur politischen Ikonologie der Gegenwart* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997).

Dietrichson, Lorentz, *Det Skönas Verld: Estetikens och Konsthistoriens Hufvudläror* (Stockholm, 1860–70).

——, *Christusbilledet* (Copenhagen, 1880).

——, *Antinoos, eine kunstarchäologische Untersuchung* (Oslo and Christiana, 1884).

Diez, Ernst, *Kunst der islamischen Völker* (Berlin, 1915).

——, *Churasanische Baudenkmäler* (Berlin, 1918).

——, *Türk Sanatı: Başlangıcından Günümüze Kadar* (Istanbul, 1946).

Dikovitskaya, Margaret, *Visual Culture: The Study of the Visual after the Cultural Turn* (Cambridge, MA, 2005, 2nd printing 2006).

Dilly, Heinrich, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker 1933–1945* (Munich and Berlin, 1988).

——, ed., *Altmeister moderner Kunstgeschichte: Kunstgeschichte zur Einführung* (Berlin, 1990, 2nd, rev. edn. 1999).

DiMaggio, Paul, *Managers of the Arts* (Cabin John, MD, 1986).

——, 'Classification in Art', *American Sociological Review* 52 (1987) 440–55.

Dimitrova, Elizabeta and Sašo Korunovski, *Macedonia: l'arte medievale dal IX al XV secolo* (Milan, 2006).

Dittmann, Lorenz, 'Zur Entwicklung des Stilbegriffs bis Winckelmann', in *Kunstgeschichte und Kunsttheorie 1400–1900*, ed. Peter Ganz, Martin Gosebruch, Nicolaus Meier, and Martin Warnke (Wiesbaden, 1991) 189–218.

Djordjević, Ivan, *Zidno slikarstvo srpske vlastele u doba Nemanjića* (Belgrade, 1994).

Djurić, Vojislav, *Byzantinische Fresken in Jugoslawien* (Munich, 1976).

Dogramaci, Burcu, 'Kunstgeschichte in Istanbul: Die Begründung der Disziplin durch den Wiener Kunsthistoriker Ernst Diez', in *Kunstgeschichte im 'Dritten Reich': Theorien, Methoden, Praktiken*, ed. Ruth Heftrig, Olaf Peters, and Barbara Schellewald (Berlin, 2008) 114–33.

Doll, Nikola, Christian Fuhrmeister, and Michael H. Sprenger, eds., *Kunstgeschichte im Nationalsozialismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte einer Wissenschaft zwischen 1930 und 1950* (Weimar, 2005).

Douven, Igor, 'Style and Supervenience', *British Journal of Aesthetics* 39.3 (1999) 255–62.

Dragojević, Predrag, 'Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti', in *Filozofski fakultet 1838–1998: period 1963–1998*, ed. Rade Mihaljčić (Belgrade, 1998) 361–87.

——, *Istorija umetnosti u Srbiji u prvoj polovini XX veka* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2001).

Drăguţ, Vasile, 'Cercetări cu privire la arta medievală românească', in *Istoria ştiinţelor în România: Ştiinţa literaturii: Istoriografia de artă*, ed. Alexandru Dima and Mircea Popescu (Bucharest, 1979).

Drinov, Marin and Josef Konstantin Jirecek, *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Prague, 1876).

Drumev, Dimitar, *Златарско изкуство* (Sofia, 1976).

——, *Резбарско изкуство* (Sofia, 1989).

Duchamp, Marcel, 'L'artiste doit-il aller à l'université?' Lecture held at the symposium *Should the Artist go to College?* at the Hofstra College in Hempstead (Long Island, NY) in 1960, in *Duchamp du signe: Ecrits*, ed. Michel Sanouillet (Paris, 1975) 236–9.

Dufrêne, Thierry, 'Das Institut des Hautes Etudes en arts plastiques de Paris (1988–1995): eine Utopie ohne Zukunft?' in *Kunstausbildung: Aneignung und Vermittlung künstlerischer Kompetenz*, ed. Peter J. Schneemann and Wolfgang Brückle (Munich, 2008) 21–34.

Dufrêne, Thierry and Anne-Christine Taylor, eds., *Cannibalismes disciplinaires: Quand l'histoire de l'art et l'anthropologie se rencontrent* (Paris, 2009).

Dumitrescu, Carmen Gabriela, 'Vechi preocupări româneşti de iniţiere în istoria artei europene', *Studii şi Cercetări de Istoria Artei* 23 (1976) 41–67.

Duro, Paul and Michael Greenhalgh, eds., *Essential Art History* (London, 1992).

de Duve, Thierry and Rosalind Krauss, 'Echoes of the Readymade: Critique of Pure Modernism', *October* 70 (1994) 60–97.

de Duve, Thierry, *Pictorial Nominalism: On Marcel Duchamp's Passage from Painting to the Readymade* (Minneapolis, MN, 1991).

——, *Kant after Duchamp* (Cambridge, MA, 1998).

——, *Voici, 100 ans d'art contemporain* (Ghent, 2000).

——, *Clement Greenberg between the Lines: Including a Debate with Clement Greenberg* (Chicago, IL, 2010).

Dvořák, Max, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte: Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung* (Vienna, 1924).

Edwards, Edward, *The Fine Arts in England; their State and Prospects considered relatively to National Education, Part 1: Administrative Economy of the Fine Arts* (London, 1840).

Egli, Ernst, *Sinan: Ein Baumeister osmanischer Glanzzeit* (Erlenbach-Zürich, 1954).

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, Irenäus and Christa Sütterlin, *Weltsprache Kunst: Zur Natur- und Kunstgeschichte bildlicher Kommunikation* (Vienna, 2007).

Einckel, Caspar Friedrich, *Museographia oder: Anleitung zum rechten Begriff und nützlicher Auslegung der Museorum, oder Raritäten-Kammern* (Leipzig and Breslau, 1727).

von Einem, Herbert, ed., *Akten des 21. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte in Bonn 1964/International Congress of the History of Art*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1964).

Elam, Caroline, 'Art history or *Kunstgeschichte*?' *The Burlington Magazine* 129 (1987) 643–4.

Eletti, Valerio, *Manuale di editoria multimediale* (Rome and Bari, 2003).

Elias, Norbert, *Mozart: Zur Soziologie eines Genies* (Frankfurt am Main, 1991).

——, *The Civilizing Process*: *Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, trans. Edmund Jephcott, ed. Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell (Oxford, rev. edn., 2000).

Elkins, James, *Our Beautiful, Dry and Distant Texts: Art History as Writing* (London, 2000).

——, *Stories of Art* (New York and London, 2002).

——, *Visual Studies: A Skeptical Introduction* (New York and London, 2003).

——, *What Happened to Art Criticism?* (Chicago, IL, 2003).

——, ed., *Art History Versus Aesthetics* (New York and London, 2006).

——, ed., *Is Art History Global?* (New York, 2007).

——, 'Writing about Modernist Painting outside Western Europe and North America', in *Compression vs. Expression: Containing the World's Art*, ed. John Onians (New Haven, CT, 2007) 188–214.

——, 'Can We Invent a World Art Studies?' in *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, ed. Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme (Amsterdam, 2008) 107–18.

——, ed., *Artists with PhDs: On the New Doctoral Degree in Studio Art* (Washington, 2009).

Elkins, James and Michael Newman, eds., *The State of Art Criticism* (New York and London, 2008).

Ellenius, Allan, 'Art History', in *Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University, History, Art and Philosophy*, ed. Carl Göran Andrae (Uppsala, 1976) 11–18.

Eller, Mart, 'Tartu Ülikooli osast Eesti kunstiteaduses 1920–30-ndail aastail', *Kunstiteadus, kunstikriitika* 5, 6 (Tallinn, 1983, 1986) 60–75, 158–173.

Eller, Mart-Ivo, *Eesti kunsti ja arhitektuuri biograafiline leksikon* (Tallinn, 1996).

Elling, Christian, *Holmes bygningshistorie: 1680–1930* (Copenhagen, 1932).

——, *Det klassiske København: en byaestetisk studie* (Copenhagen, 1944).

——, *Rom: Arkitekturens liv fra Bernini til Thorvaldsen* (Copenhagen, 1956).

——, *Rome: The Biography of Its Architecture from Bernini to Thorvaldsen*, trans. Bob and Inge Gosney (Colorado, 1975).

Elliott, David, 'Balkanischer Barock', in *Marina Abramovic: Objects Performance Video Sound* (exhibition catalogue Museum Villa Stuck, Munich), ed. Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker and Chrissie Iles (Munich, 1996).

Elsner, Jás, 'Style', in *Critical Terms for Art History*, ed. Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff (Chicago, IL, 2003) 98–109.

Éméric-David, Toussaint-Bernard, *Musée Olympique de Lécole vivante des beaux arts: ou considérations sur la nécessité de cet établissement, et sur les moyens de le rendre aussi utile qu'il peut l'être* (Paris, 1796).

Emiliani, Andrea, *Una politica dei beni culturali* (Turin, 1974).

Enescu, Theodor, 'Simbolismul şi pictura: Un capitol din evoluţia picturii şi a gustului artistic la sfârşitul secolului al XIX-lea şi începutul secolului al XX-lea', in *Pagini de artă modernă românească*, ed. Institutul de Istoria Artei (Bucharest, 1974) 7–57.

Enwezor, Okwui and Chika Okeke-Agulu, eds., *Contemporary African Art since 1980* (Bologna, 2009).

Erdeljan, Jelena, *Ideja Jerusalima i gradovi—prestonice država pravoslavnih Slovena u poznom srednjem veku* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2008).

Erm, Voldemar, *Lähtemeistrid* (Tallinn, 1984).

von Essenwein, August, *Die mittelalterlichen Kunstdenkmale der Stadt Krakau* (Leipzig, 1869).

Evangelidis, Demetrios E., *I elliniki tehni* (Athens, 1969).

——, *Greek Art*, trans. Irvin Ziemann (Athens, 1973).

Evans, Jessica and Stuart Hall, eds., *Visual Culture: The Reader* (Thousand Oaks, CA, and London, 1999).

Evans, Joan, *English Art 1307–1461* (Oxford, 1949).

Eyice, Semavi, 'Ayasofya mozayikleri ve bunları meydana çıkartan Thomas Wittemore', *TTOK Belleteni* 113 (1951) 1–12.

——, 'Une nouvelle hypothèse sur une mosaïque de Sainte Sophie à Istanbul', *Actes du XII. Congrès des Etudes Byzantines* 3 (Belgrade, 1964) 99–101.

——, *Ayasofya*, 1 and 2 (Istanbul, 1984).

——, 'Ayasofyalar', *Ayasofya Müzesi Yıllığı* 11 (1990) 1–17.

——, 'Ernst Arnold Egli', *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı-İslâm Ansiklopedisi* 10 (1994) 482–83.

Fagiolo, Maurizio, *Realismo magico: Pittura e scultura in Italia, 1919–1925* (Milan, 1988).

Fanon, Frantz, *The Wretched of the Earth* (London, 1965).

——, *Black Skin, White Masks* (London, 1968).

Farr, Denis, *English Art 1870–1940* (Oxford, 1979).

Feist, Peter H., 'Schwierige Nachbarschaft: Die Kunstgeschichtswissenschaft in der DDR in ihrem Verhältnis zur Kunstgeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft in den benachbarten ostmitteleuropäischen Ländern', in *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der nationale Diskurs*, ed. Robert Born, Alena Janatková, and Adam S. Labuda (Berlin, 2004) 421–34.

Feldstein, Martin, ed., *The Economics of Art Museums* (Chicago, IL, 1991).

Fernández, Bozal, *Goya y el gusto moderno* (Madrid, 1997).

——, *Francisco Goya: Vida y obra*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 2005).

Fernie, Eric, ed., *Art History and its Methods: A Critical Anthology* (London, 1995).

Fiedler, Konrad, *On Judging Works of Visual Arts* (1876), trans. Henry Schaefer-Simmern and Fulmer Mood (Berkeley, CA, 1949).

Fierens-Gevaert, Hippolyte, *Essai sur l'art contemporain* (Brussels, 1897).

——, Hippolyte, *Psychologie d'une ville: Essai sur Bruges* (Brussels, 1901).

Filer, Randall, 'The Starving Artist: Myth or Reality? Earnings of Artists in the United States', *Journal of Political Economy* 94 (1986) 56–75.

Filitz, Hermann, ed., *Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Österreich*, 6 vols. (Munich and New York, 1998–2002).

Filov, Bogdan, *Антични паметници в Народния музей* (Sofia, 1912).

——, *Софийската църква 'Св. София'* (Sofia, 1913).

——, *Early Bulgarian Art* (Bern, 1919).

——, *L'ancien Art Bulgare* (Paris, 1922).

——, *Старобългарското изкуство: (Изследване)* (Sofia, 1924).

——, 'Възраждането на българското изкуство', *Българска историческа библиотека*, кн. II, III (Sofia, 1931).

Fiori, Teresa, ed., *Archivi del Divisionismo*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1969).

Fischer, Jean, 'Invisible Histories: Magiciens de la Terre', *Artforum International* 28 (1989) 158–61.

Fischer von Erlach, Johann Bernhard, *Entwurf einer historischen Architectur, in Abbildung unterschiedener berühmten Gebäude, des Alterthums und fremder Völcker* (Vienna, 1721).

Fish, Stanley, *Professional Correctness: Literary Studies and Political Change* (Oxford, 1995).

——, 'Boutique Multiculturalism, or Why Liberals are Incapable of Thinking about Hate Speech', *Critical Inquiry* 23 (1997) 378–95.

Florida, Richard, *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* (New York, 2002).

Focillon, Henri, *The Life of Forms in Art* (1934), trans. Charles Beecher Hogan and George Kubler (New York, 1989).

Foister, Susan, Ashok Roy, and Martin Wyld, *Making and Meaning: Holbein's Ambassadors* (London, 1998).

Fontanille, Jacques, *Sémiotique du visible: Des mondes de lumière* (Paris, 1995).

Ford, Brian, *Images of Science: A History of Scientific Illustration* (London, 1992).

Fossati, Paolo, *Valori Plastici, 1918–1922* (Turin, 1981).

——, *La pittura metafisica* (Turin, 1988).

Foster, Arnold W. and Judith R. Blau, eds., *Art and Society: Readings in the Sociology of the Arts* (New York, 1989).

Foster, Hal, ed., *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (Seattle, WA, 1983).

Fotiadis, Michael, 'Ruins into Relics: Classical Archaeology, European Identities and Their Refractions', *Pharos* XI (2003) 84–6.

Fotić, Aleksandar, ed., *Privatni život kod Srba u osvit modernog doba* (Belgrade, 2005).

Foucault, Michel, *Les Mots et les Choses* (Paris, 1966).

——, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison,* trans. Alan Sheridan (New York, 1977).

——, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London, 1986).

Francastel, Pierre, *Études de sociologie de l'art: Création picturale et société* (Paris, 1970).

——, *La Réalité figurative: Éléments structurels de sociologie de l'art*, (Paris, 2nd edn., 1978) (first published 1965).

——, *Études de sociologie de l'art: Création picturale et société*, (Paris, 2nd edn., 1989) (first published 1970).

Frank, Gustav and Barbara Lange, *Einführung in die Bildwissenschaft: Bilder in der visuellen Kultur* (Darmstadt, 2010).

Franzoni, Lanfranco, 'Il Museo Maffeiano secondo l'ordinamento di Scipione Maffei', in *Nuovi studi Maffeiani: atti del Convegno Scipione Maffei e il Museo maffeiano: Verona 18–19 novembre 1983, Ridotto dell'Accademia filarmonica* (Verona, 1985) 207–32.

Fraser, Andrea, *Works: 1984 to 2003*, ed. Yilmaz Dziewior (Cologne, 2003).

——, 'From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique', *Artforum* 44.1 (2005) 278–83.

Freedberg, David, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago, IL, 1989, reprinted 1991).

——, *The Eye of the Lynx: Galileo, his Friends and the Beginnings of Modern Natural History* (Chicago, IL, 2003).

Freidson, Eliot, 'Les professions artistiques comme défi à l'analyse sociologique', *Revue française de sociologie* XXVII.3 (1986) 431–44.

French Ministry of Culture, 'Loi 2002–5 du 4 Janvier 2002 modifiée relative aux musées de France' (Paris, 2002).

Freud, Sigmund, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, ed. and trans. James Strachey (New York, 1989).

Fresnault-Deruelle, Pierre, *Le Silence des tableaux* (Paris, 2005).

Frey, Bruno and Reiner Eichenberger, 'On the Rate of Return in the Art Market: Survey and Evaluation', *European Economic Review* 39 (1995) 529–37.

Frey, Bruno and Stephan Meier, 'The Economics of Museums', in *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby (Amsterdam, 2006) 1017–50.

Frey, Dagobert, *Krakau* (Berlin, 1941).

Fried, Michael, *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot* (Chicago, IL, 1988).

——, 'Art and Objecthood', (1967), in Fried, *Art and Objecthood* (Chicago, IL, 1998) 148–72.

Friedländer, Max, *From Van Eyck to Brueghel*, trans. Marguarite Kay, ed. Fritz Grossmann (London, 1956).

Friis, Eva, 'Et opgør med Julius Lange: Kunsthistorikeren Vilhelm Wanschers æstetiske kunstopfattelse', in *Viljen til det menneskelige. Tekster omkring Julius Lange*, ed. Hans Dam Christensen, Hanne Kolind Poulsen, and Peter Nørgaard Larsen (Copenhagen, 1999) 233–56.

Fry, Roger, *Vision and Design* (London, 1920).

Fuhrmann, Manfred, *Der europäische Bildungskanon des bürgerlichen Zeitalters* (Frankfurt am Main, 1999).

Gablik, Suzi, *Progress in Art* (London, 1984).

Gadzheva, Katerina, *Между желаното и действителното: фотографията и 'нагледна агитация' в България 1948–1956* (PhD Dissertation, Sofia, 2010).

Gaehtgens, Thomas W., *Die Berliner Museumsinsel im Deutschen Kaiserreich: Zur Kulturpolitik der Museen in der wilhelminischen Epoche* (Munich, 1992).

Gage, John, *Colour and Meaning: Art, Science and Symbolism* (London, 2000).

Galard, Jean, *Le regard instruit: Action éducative et action culturelle dans les musées* (Paris, 2000).

——, 'L'art sans œuvre', in *L'œuvre d'art totale*, ed. Jean Galard and Julian Zugazagoitia (Paris, 2003) 161–82, 195–6.

Galaunė, Paulius, *Lietuvių liaudies menas, jo meninių formų plėtojimosi pagrindai* (Kaunas, 1930; reprint Vilnius, 1988).

——, *L'art Lithuanien: Un recueil d'images avec une introduction*, ed. John Kroon (Malmö, 1934).

Galenson, David and Robert Jensen, 'Young Geniuses and Old Masters: The Life Cycles of Great Artists from Masaccio to Jasper Johns', *NBER Working Paper 8368* (July 2001).

Galenson, David, *Painting Outside the Lines: Patterns of Creativity in Modern Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2001).

——, *The Life Cycles of Modern Artists: Theory, Measurement, and Implications*, unpublished manuscript, 2003.

Galison, Peter, 'Images Scatter into Data, Data Gather into Images', in *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art*, ed. Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel (Cambridge, MA, 2002) 300–23.

Gállego, Julián, *Visión y símbolos en la pintura española del siglo de oro* (Madrid, 1972).

Gambillo, Maria Drudi and Teresa Fiori, eds., *Archivi del Futurismo*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1958–62).

Gamboni, Dario, *The Destruction of Art: Iconoclasm and Vandalism Since the French Revolution* (London, 1997).

Gardner, Julian, 'L'enseignement de l'histoire de l'art au Royaume Uni', *Revue de l'Art* 125.1 (1999) 5–7.

Gaya Nuño, Juan Antonio, *Historia de la crítica de arte en España* (Madrid, 1975).

——, *Obras Completas*, ed. Consolación Baranda, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1999–2000).

Gell, Alfred, *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory* (Oxford, 1998).

——, *L'art et ses agents: Une théorie anthropologique*, trans. Olivier Renaut and Sophie Renaut (Dijon, 2009).

Gellner, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford, 2nd edn., 2006) (first published 1983).

Gelshorn, Julia, 'Der Künstler spricht: Vom Umgang mit den Texten Gerhard Richters', in *Legitimationen: Künstlerinnen und Künstler als Autoritäten der Gegenwartskunst*, ed. Julia Gelshorn (Bern, 2005) 127–48.

Genova, Irina and Angel Angelov, *Следистории на изкуството* (Sofia, 2001).

Genova, Irina and Tatiana Dimitrova, *Изкуството в България през 1920-те години: Модернизъм и национална идея* (Sofia, 2002).

Genova, Irina, *Модернизми и модерност (не въможност за историзиране: Изкуство в България и художествен обмен с балканските страни* (Sofia, 2004).

Georgiadou-Kountoura, Efthimia, 'Istoria tis tehnis', in *Filosofiki Scholi Thessalonikis: Ta prota 75 hronia* (Thessaloniki, 2000).

Gerevich, Tibor, *Magyarországi művészet Szent István korában* (Budapest, 1938).

Gergova, Ivanka, *Корпус на стенописите в България от XVIII век* (Sofia, 2006).

Germer, Stefan, 'Mit den Augen des Kartographen—Navigationshilfen im Posthistoire', in *Kunst ohne Geschichte? Ansichten zu Kunst und Kunstgeschichte heute*, ed. Anne-Marie Bonnet and Gabriele Kopp-Schmidt (Munich, 1995) 140–51.

——, 'Die schwierigen Zeitgenossen: Über die Probleme der Historisierung aktueller Kunst', in *Germeriana: Unveröffentlichte oder übersetzte Schriften von Stefan Germer zur zeitgenössischen und modernen Kunst*, ed. Jutta Bernard (Cologne, 1999) 219–32.

Geshov, S., 'Инжинери и артисти', *БИАД* 11 and 12 (1899) 250–2.

Gieysztor-Miłobędzka, Elżbieta, 'Warszawski Instytut Sztuki—dzieło Juliusza Starzyńskiego', in *Dzieje storii sztuki w Polsce: Kształtowanie się instytucji naukowych w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. Adam S. Labuda (Poznań, 1996) 246–57.

Gilmore, Jonathan, *The Life of a Style: Beginnings and Endings in the Narrative History of Art* (London, 2000).

Giner de los Ríos, Francisco, *Estudios sobre las artes industriales* (Madrid, 1892).

Ginsburgh, Victor and Sheila Weyers, 'De Piles, Drawing and Color: An Essay in Quantitative Art History', *Artibus et Historiae* 45 (2002) 101–14.

——, 'Creation and Life Cycles of Artists', *Journal of Cultural Economics* 30 (2006) 91–107.

——, 'On the Contemporaneousness of Roger de Piles' Balance des Peintres', in *Sublime Economy: On the Intersection of Art and Economics*, ed. Jack Amariglio, Stephen E. Cullenberg, and Joseph W. Childers (London, 2008) 112–23.

Ginsburgh, Victor, Michael Moses, and Jianping Mei, 'The Computation of Art Indices in Art', in *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby (Amsterdam, 2006) 947–82.

Ginsburgh, Victor and David Throsby, eds., *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture* (Amsterdam, 2006).

Ginsburgh, Victor, François Mairesse, and Sheila Weyers, 'De la narration à la consecration: L'exemple de la peinture flamande de Van Eyck à Rubens', *Histoire et Mesure* 23 (2008) 145–76.

Gintz, Claude, ed., *Regards américains sur l'art des années soixante* (Paris, 1979).

Ginzburg, Carlo, 'Clues: Roots of an Evidential Method', in Ginzburg, *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*, trans. Anne and John Tedeschi (Baltimore, MD, 1989) 96–125.

——, *The Enigma of Piero: Piero della Francesca*, trans. Martin Ryle and Kate Soper (London, 2002) (first published 1983).

Gjestrum, John Aage, 'Museology and Research: The Present Situation in a Norwegian Perspective', *Nordisk Museologi* 2 (1995) 5–22.

Glendinning, Nigel, 'Xavier de Salas Obituary', *Burlington Magazine* 124.955 (1982) 633–4.

Goldman, Alan, 'Evaluating Art', in *The Blackwell Guide to Aesthetics*, ed. Peter Kivy (Oxford, 2004) 93–108.

Goldmar, Daniel, Lawrence Kramer, and Richard Leppert, 'Introduction: Phonoplay: Recasting Film Music', in *Beyond the Soundtrack: Representing Music in Cinema*, ed. Daniel Goldmar, Lawrence Kramer, and Richard Leppert (Berkeley, CA, 2007) 1–12.

Gomart, Emilie and Antoine Hennion, 'A Sociology of Attachment: Music Amateurs, Drug Users', *Sociological Review* 46.5, 220–47.

Gombrich, Ernst H., *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (London, 1966).

——, *In Search of Cultural History* (Oxford, 1969).

——, *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography* (Oxford, 1970).

——, 'Canons and Values in the Visual Arts: A Correspondence with Quentin Bell', *Critical Inquiry* 2.3 (1976), reprinted in Gombrich, *Ideals and Idols* (Oxford, 1979) 167–83.

——, 'Art History and the Social Sciences', in Gombrich, *Ideals and Idols* (Oxford, 1979) 131–66.

——, *A Lifelong Interest: Conversations on Art and Science with Didier Eribon* (London, 1993).

——, *The Sense of Order: A Study in the Psychology of Decorative Art* (London, 1994).

——, 'Style' (1968) in *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, ed. Donald Preziosi (Oxford 1998) 150–63.

——, 'Dark Varnishes: Variations on a Theme by Pliny', *Burlington Magazine* 104.707 (1962) 51–5, reprinted in David Bomford and Mark Leonard, eds., *Issues in the Conservation of Paintings* (Los Angeles, 2005) 505–18.

Gómez-Moreno, Manuel, *Iglesias mozárabes: arte español de los siglos IX a XI* (Madrid, 1919).

——, *El arte románico español* (Madrid, 1934).

——, *Arte árabe español hasta el siglo XII* (Barcelona, 1951).

——, *Catálogo monumental de España: Provincia de Salamanca* (Madrid, 1967).

——, *Catálogo monumental de España: Provincia de León* (Madrid, 1979).

——, *Catálogo monumental de España: Provincia De Zamora* (Madrid, 1980).

——, *Catálogo monumental de la provincia de Ávila* (Madrid, 2002).

González Fernández, Rafel, 'Los Foriadores de la Historia Tardoantogua: Don Manuel Gómez Moreno', *Antig. Crist.* X (1993) 667–73.

Goodman, Nelson, 'The Status of Style', *Critical Inquiry* 1.4 (1975) 799–811.

——, *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols* (Indianapolis, IN, 1976).

Goodwin, Craufurd, 'Art and Culture in the History of Economic Thought', in *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby (Amsterdam, 2006) 25–68.

Goštautienė, Rūta and Lolita Jablonskienė, eds., *Pažymėtos teritorijos* (Vilnius, 2005).

Gough, Paul, 'Commemoration of War', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, ed. Brian Graham and Peter Howard (Aldershot, 2008) 215–29.

Grabar, André, *Боянската църква* (Sofia, 1924).

——, *La peinture religieuse en Bulgarie* (Paris, 1928).

——, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin: Recherches sur l'art officiel de l'empire d'Orient* (Paris, 1936).

——, *Martyrium: Recherches sur le Culte des Reliques et l'art chrétien antique*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1946).

——, 'Pseudo-Kodinos et les Cérémonies de la Cour Byzantine au XIVème Siècle', *Art et Société à Byzance sous les Paléologues: Actes du Colloque organisé par l'Association internationale des études byzantines à Venise en septembre 1968* (Venice, 1971) 195–221.

—— *Les Voies de la création en iconographie chrétienne: Antiquité et Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1979).

——, 'Autobiographical Notes', *Izkoustvo* 7 (1986) 26–8.

Graham, Brian and Michael Murray, 'The Spiritual and the Profane: The Pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela', *Ecumene* 4 (1997) 389–409.

Graham, Brian, 'The Past in Europe's Present: Diversity, Identity and the Construction of Place', in *Modern Europe: Place, Culture, Identity*, ed. Brian Graham (London, 1998) 19–49.

Graham, Brian, Gregory J. Ashworth, and John E. Tunbridge, *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy* (London, 2000).

Graham, Brian and Peter Howard, eds., *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* (Aldershot, 2008).

Graham-Dixon, Andrew, *A History of British Art* (London, 1999).

Grampp, William, *Pricing the Priceless: Art, Artists and Economics* (New York, 1989).

——, 'A Colloquy about Art and Museums: Economics Engages Museology', in *Economics of the Arts: Selected Essays*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and Pierre-Michel Menger (Amsterdam, 1996) 221–73.

Green, Christopher, *Cubism and its Enemies: Modern Movements and Reaction in French Art 1916–1928* (London and New Haven, CT, 1987).

——, 'Les cubismes de l'Ecole de Paris', in *L'Ecole de Paris, 1904–1929, la part de l'autre*, exhibition catalogue Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris (Paris, 2001) 58–70.

Greenberg, Clement, 'Necessity of "Formalism"', *New Literary History* 3.1 (1971) 171–5.

——, *The Collected Essays and Criticism*, 4 vols., ed. John O'Brian (Chicago, IL, 1986).

Greenhalgh, Michael, 'Art History', in *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, ed. Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, and John Unsworth (Oxford, 2004) 31–45.

Griffin, Tim, 'Tino Sehgal: An Interview', *Artforum International* 43 (2005) 218–19.

Grossberg, Larry, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, eds., *Cultural Studies* (New York and London, 1992).

Grosu, Monica, *Petru Comarnescu un nelinişit în secolul său* (Bucharest, 2009).

Groupe MU (Francis Edeline, Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, and Philippe Minguet), *Traité du signe visuel* (Paris, 1993).

Groys, Boris, Iwona Blazwick, Ilya Kabakov, and David Ross, *Ilya Kabakov* (London, 1998).

Groys, Boris, *Über das Neue: Versuch einer Kulturökonomie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1999).

Grozdanov, Cvetan, *Ohridsko zidno slikarstvo XIV veka* (Belgrade, 1980).

——, *Portreti na svetitelite od Makedonija IX–XVIII vek* (Skopje, 1983).

——, *Umetnosta i kulturata na XIX vek vo Zapadna Makedonija, studii i prilozi* (Skopje, 2004).

Grünanger, Friedrich and G. Kozarov, 'Архитектурата и значението ú за строителната ни индустрия', *БИАД* 6 and 7 (1900) 109–13.

Guha-Thakurta, Tapati, *Monuments, Objects, Histories: Institutions of Art in Colonial and Postcolonial India* (New Delhi, 2004).

——, *The Making of a New "Indian" Art* (Cambridge, MA, 1992).

Guilbaut, Serge, *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom and the Cold War* (Chicago, IL, 1983).

Guleng, Mai Britt, *Kunsten og Videnskaberne: Kunsthistorie ved Det Kgl: Frederiks Universitet inntil 1875* (Oslo, 1999).

——, 'Kunsthistorisk forening og kunsthistoriefagets betingelser', *Kunst og Kultur* 3 (2004) 191–208.

——, 'Lorentz Dietrichson and the Making of Norwegian Art History', in *Towards a Science of Art History: J.J. Tikkanen and Art Historical Scholarship in Europe*, ed. Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2009) 59–70.

Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich and Michael Marrinan, eds., *Mapping Benjamin: The Work of Art in the Digital Age* (Stanford, 2003).

Guthrie, Russell Dale, *The Nature of Paleolithic Art* (Chicago, 2005).

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge, MA, 1991).

Hadjinicolaou, Nicos, *Histoire de l'art et lutte des classes* (Paris, 1973).

——, *Kunstgeschiedenis en Ideologie*, trans. Piet Berkers and Pieter Jan Gijsberts (Nijmegen, 1978).

——, 'I "koinoniki istoria tis tehnis"', *Ta Istorika* 2.4 (1985) 273–5.

——, ed., *O Greco stin Italia ke i italiki tehni* (Athens, 1995).

——, 'Ipodohi ke provoli esthitikon axion ke kallitehnikon taseon apo tin Epitheorisi Tehnis', in *Epitheorisi Tehnis: Mia Krisimi Dodekaetia* (Athens, 1997).

Haeckel, Ernst, *Generelle Morphologie der Organismen* (Berlin, 1866).

Haehnel, Birgit, *Regelwerk und Umgestaltung: Nomadistische Denkweisen in der Kunstwahrnehmung nach 1945* (Berlin, 2006).

von Hagenow, Elisabeth, *Politik und Bild: Die Postkarte als Medium der Propaganda* (Hamburg, 1994).

Halbertsma, Marlite, *Wilhelm Pinder und die deutsche Kunstgeschichte* (Worms, 1985; first published in Dutch 1985).

——, 'The Call of the Canon: Why Art History Cannot Do Without', in *Making Art History: A Changing Discipline and Its Institutions*, ed. Elizabeth C. Mansfield (New York, 2007) 16–30.

——, 'The Many Beginnings and One End of World Art History in Germany, 1900–1933', in *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, ed. Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme (Amsterdam, 2008) 91–105.

Hall, Stuart, 'Encoding, Decoding', in *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During (London, 1993) 90–103.

——, *Introduction to Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall (London, 1997) 1–12.

——, ed., *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (London, 1997).

Hammer-Schenk, Harold, 'Architektur und Nationalbewußtsein—Wandlungen vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert', in *Funkkolleg Kunst: Eine Geschichte der Kunst im Wandel ihrer Funktionen* I, ed. Werner Busch (Munich, 1987) 559–85.

Hanfling, Oswald, 'The Problem of Definition', in *Philosophical Aesthetics: An Introduction*, ed. Oswald Hanfling (Oxford, 1992) 1–40.

Hannula, Mika, Julia Suoranta, and Tere Vadén, eds., *Artistic Research: Theories, Methods and Practices* (Gothenburg, 2005).

von Hansen, Gotthard, *Die Sammlungen inländischer Alterthümer und anderer auf die baltischen Provinzen bezüglichen Gegenstände des Estländischen Provinzial-Museums* (Reval, 1875).

Harris, Jonathan, *The New Art History: A Critical Introduction* (London, 2001).

——, *Art History: The Key Concepts* (London, 2006).

Harrod, Roy, *The Life of John Maynard Keynes* (London, 1951).

Harvey, David C., 'The History of Heritage', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, ed. Brian Graham and Peter Howard (Aldershot, 2008) 19–36.

Haskell, Francis and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500–1900* (London and New Haven, CT, 1981).

Haskell, Francis, *Patrons and Painters: Study in the Relations between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque* (London, 1963).

——, *Rediscoveries in Art: Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and in France* (London, 1980).

——, *History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past* (London and New Haven, CT, 1993).

——, *The Ephemeral Museum: Old Master Paintings and the Rise of the Modern Art Exhibition* (London and New Haven, CT, 2000).

Hassenpflug, Dieter, Burkhardt Kolbmüller and Sebastian Schröder-Esch, eds., *Heritage and Media in Europe: Contributing Towards Integration and Regional Development* (Weimar, 2006).

Hatt, Michael and Charlotte Klonk, *Art History: A Critical Introduction to Its Methods* (Manchester, 2006).

Hauser, Arnold, *The Social History of Art* (1951), 4 vols. (London 1999).

——, *The Philosophy of Art History* (London, 1958).

Hausmann, Frank-Rutger, *'Deutsche Geisteswissenschaft' im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Die 'Aktion Ritterbusch' (1940–1945)*: *Schriften zur Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte 1* (Dresden and Munich, 1998).

Hautecoeur, Louis, *Architecture et aménagement des musées* (Paris, 1993).

Heffernan, Michael, 'For Ever England: The Western Front and the Politics of Remembrance in Britain', *Ecumene* 2 (1995) 293–324.

Heftrig, Ruth, Olaf Peters, and Barbara Schellewald, eds., *Kunstgeschichte im 'Dritten Reich': Theorien, Methoden, Praktiken.* (Berlin, 2008).

Heinich, Nathalie, *Du peintre à l'artiste: Artisans et académiciens à l'âge classique* (Paris, 1993).

——, *Harald Szeemann, un cas singulier* (Paris, 1995).

——, *The Glory of Van Gogh: An Anthropology of Admiration,* trans. Paul Leduc Browne (Princeton, NJ, 1996).

——, 'Pourquoi la sociologie parle des œuvres d'art, et comment elle pourrait en parler', *Sociologie de l'art* 10 (1997) 11–23.

——, *Ce que l'art fait à la sociologie* (Paris, 1998).

——, *La Sociologie de l'art* (Paris, 2001).

——, *L'Elite Artiste: Excellence et Singularité en Régime Démocratique* (Paris, 2005).

——, 'Objets, problématiques, terrains, méthodes: pour un pluralisme méthodique', *Sociologie de l'art-Opus* 9–10 (2006) 15–27.

——, *Pourquoi Bourdieu?* (Paris, 2007).

——, *La Fabrique du patrimoine: De la cathédrale à la petite cuillère* (Paris, 2009).

Heinich, Nathalie and Roberta Shapiro, eds., *De l'artification: Enquêtes sur le passage à l'art* (Paris, forthcoming).

Held, Jutta, Dirk Janssen, Bettina Kohlstedt, Martin Papenbrock, Sophie Reinhardt, Hilde Schreiner, and Rosemarie Sprute, eds., *Kunstgeschichte an den Universitäten im Nationalsozialismus*: *Kunst und Politik, Jahrbuch der Guernica-Gesellschaft* 5 (Göttingen, 2003).

Helme, Sirje and Jaak Kangilaski, *Lühike Eesti kunsti ajalugu* (Tallinn, 1999).

Helme, Sirje and Johannes Saar, eds., *Noisy Nineties: Problems, Themes and Meanings in Estonian Art on 1990s* (Tallinn, 2001).

Hennion, Antoine, *La Passion musicale: Sociologie de la médiation* (Paris, 1993).

Hermens, Erma and Joyce H. Townsend, eds., *Sources and Serendipity: Testimonies of Artists' Practice: Proceedings of the Third Symposium of the Art Technological Source Research Working Group, Glasgow 2008* (London, 2009).

von Heydebrand, Renate, ed., *Kanon, Macht, Kultur: Theoretische, historische und soziale Aspekte ästhetischer Kanonbildungen* (Stuttgart, 1998).

von Hildebrand, Adolf, 'The Problem of Form in the Fine Arts', (1893) in Hildebrand, *Empathy, Form and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873–1893*, ed. Harry F. Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonomou (Santa Monica, CA, 1994) 227–79.

Hipp, Hermann and Ernst Seidl, eds., *Architektur als politische Kultur—Philosophia Practica* (Berlin, 1996).

Hirsch, Eric D., 'Stylistics and Synonymy', *Critical Inquiry* 1.3 (1975) 559–79.

Höflechner, Walter und Götz Pochat, eds., *100 Jahre Kunstgeschichte an der Universität Graz. Mit einem Ausblick auf die Geschichte des Faches an den deutschsprachigen österreichischen Universitäten bis in das Jahr 1938* (Graz 1992).

Hogarth, William, *The Analysis of Beauty* (1753), ed. Joseph Burke (Oxford, 1955).

Holly, Michael Ann, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* (Princeton, NJ, 1985).
——, 'Past Looking', *Critical Inquiry* 16 (1990) 371–96.
Holly, Michael Ann and Keith Moxey, eds., *Art History, Aesthetics, Visual Studies* (London and New Haven, CT, 2002).
Holly, Michael, 'What is Research in Art History Anyway?' in *Art History on Demand? Dienstleistung Kunstgeschichte?* ed. Oskar Bätschmann, Julia Gelshorn, Norberto Gramaccini, Bernd Nicolai, and Peter J. Schneemann (Emdsdetten, 2008) 92–8.
Honneth, Axel, *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts* (Cambridge, 1995).
Honold, Alexander and Ralf Simon, eds., *Das Erzählende und das Erzählte Bild* (Munich, 2010).
Horová, Anděla, ed., *Nová encyklopedie českého výtvarného umění* (Prague, 1995).
Hoving, Thomas, *Making the Mummies Dance: Inside the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York, 1993).
Hristou, Athanasios, 'Hrysanthos Hristou: Viografika', in *Hrysanthos Hristou: Afieroma*, ed. Efthimia Georgiadou-Kountoura and Antonis Kotidis (Thessaloniki, 2006) 13–25.
Hristou, Hrysanthos, *Sintomi istoria tis neoteris ke sinhronis kypriakis tehnis* (Nicosia, 1983).
Hubert, Hans W., ed., *Das Kunsthistorische Institut in Florenz: Von der Gründung bis zum hundertjährigen Jubiläum 1897–1997* (Florence, 1997).
Hudson, Kate, *Breaking the South Slav Dream: The Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia* (London, 2003).
Hudson, Kenneth, *Museums of Influence* (Cambridge, 1987).
Hulin de Loo, Georges, *Heures de Milan: Troisième partie des Très-Belles Heures de Notre Dame, enluminées par les peintres de Jean de France, Duc de Berry* (Brussels, 1910–11).
Hume, David, 'Of the Standard of Taste', (1757) in David Hume, *Of the Standard of Taste and Other Essays*, ed. John W. Lenz (Indianapolis, IN, 1965) 3–24.
Hummelen, Ijsbrand and Dionne Sillé, *Modern Art: Who Cares* (Amsterdam 1999).
Hüppauf, Bernd and Peter Weingart, eds., *Frosch und Frankenstein: Bilder als Medium der Popularisierung von Wissenschaft* (Bielefeld, 2009).
Hyde, Marina, 'Thus Spoke Entropa: The EU Defined in an Airfix Model', *Guardian*, 17 January 2009, 36.
Iamurri, Laura, 'Berenson, la pittura moderna e la nuova critica italiana', *Prospettiva* 87–8 (1997) 69–90.
——, 'Questions de genre et histoire de l'art en Italie', *Perspective* 4 (2007) 716–21.
Imdahl, Max, *Giotto: Arenafresken: Ikonographie, Ikonologie, Ikonik* (Münster, 1980).
——, 'Ikonik: Bilder und ihre Anschauung', in *Was ist ein Bild?*, ed. Gottfried Boehm (Munich, 1994) 187–211.
Ingamells, John, *The Davies Collection of French Art* (Cardiff, 1967).
Inglis, David and John Hughson, eds., *The Sociology of Art: Ways of Seeing* (London, 2005).
Iorga, Nicolae and George Balş, *Histoire de l'art roumain ancien* (Paris, 1922).
Irigaray, Luce, *Speculum of the Other Woman*, trans. Gillian C. Gill (Ithaca, 1987).
Isaković, Bojana, Dinko Davidov, and Radomir Stanić, *Genocide against the Serbs: 1941–1945, 1991–1992* (Belgrade, 1992).
Jablonskienė, Lolita, *Naujoji Lietuvos dailė* (Vilnius, 2008).
Jahn, Johannes, ed., *Die Kunstwissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1924).
Jameson, Fredric, *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983–1998* (London and New York, 1998).
Jankevičiūtė, Giedrė, *Dailė ir valstybė: Dailės gyvenimas Lietuvos Respublikoje 1918–1940* (Kaunas, 2003).
Jansen, Leo, Hans Luijten and Nienke Bakker, eds., *Vincent van Gogh—De brieven: De volledige uitgave* (Amsterdam, 2009). Co-edition: *Vincent van Gogh—The Letters: The Complete Edition*, 6 vols. (London, 2009).

Jardine, Lisa and Jerry Brotton, *Global Interests: Renaissance Art Between East and West* (London, 2003).

Jarzewicz, Jarosław, Janusz Pazder and Tadeusz J. Żuchowski, eds., *Historia sztuki dziś*, ed. (Warsaw, 20010).

Jay, Martin, *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-century French Thought* (Los Angeles, 1994).

Jimenez, Marc, *La querelle de l'art contemporain* (Paris, 2005).

Joachimides, Alexis, *Die Museumsreformbewegung in Deutschland und die Entstehung des modernen Museums 1880–1940* (Dresden, 2001).

Johnson, Steven, *Interface Culture: How New Technology Transforms the Way We Create and Communicate* (San Francisco, 1997).

Jokimov, Petar, 'Architektur in Bulgarien 1878–1920/Архитектурата в България, 1878–1920', in *Bulgarien: Architektonische Fragmente/България—архитектурни фрагменти*, ed. Adolf Stiller (Salzburg, 2007) 42–57.

Joselit, David, *Feedback: Television against Democracy* (Cambridge, MA, 2007).

Joughin, John and Simon Malpas, eds., *The New Aestheticism* (Manchester, 2004).

Jovanović, Miodrag, *Medju javom i med snom: srpsko slikarstvo 1830–1860* (Belgrade, 1992).

——, *Mihailo Milovanović* (Belgrade and Užice, 2001).

——, *Djoka Jovanović 1861–1953* (Novi Sad, 2005).

Juske, Ants, Jaak Kangilaski, Reet Varblane, *20. sajandi kunst* (Tallinn, 1994).

Kadijević, Aleksandar, *Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila u srpskoj arhitekturi (sredina XIX–sredina XX veka)* (Belgrade, 1997).

Kafetsi, Anna, ed., *Metamorfoseis tou modernou: I elliniki empeiria* (Athens, 1992).

Kairiūkštytė-Jacynienė, Halina, *Pažaislis, Ein Barockkloster in Litauen* (Kaunas, 1930).

Kaiser, Gerhard R. and Stefan Matuschek, eds., *Begründungen des Kanon: Beiträge aus der Literatur- und Kunstwissenschaft, Philosophie und Theologie* (Heidelberg, 2001).

Kalinova, Evgeniya and Iskra Baeva, *Българските преходи (1939–2002)* (Sofia, 2002) 175–218.

Kalinowski, Lech, 'Model funkcjonalny przekazu wizualnego na przykładzie renesansowego dzieła sztuki', in *Renesans: Sztuka i ideologia*, ed. Tadeus S. Jaroszweski (Warsaw, 1976) 165–77.

——, 'Sztuka średniowieczna a ideologia', in *Fermentum massae mundi: Jackowi Woźniakowskiemu w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. Nawojka Cieślińska and Piotr Rudziński (Warsaw, 1990) 357–62.

——, 'Dzieje i dorobek naukowy Komisji Historii Sztuki Akademii Umiejętności i Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności 1873–1952 oraz powstanie Katedry Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1882', in *Dzieje storii sztuki w Polsce: Kształtowanie się instytucji naukowych w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. Adam S. Labuda (Poznań, 1996) 25–33.

Kallestrup, Shona, 'Romanian "National Style" and the 1906 Bucharest Jubilee Exhibition', *Journal of Design History* 15.3 (2002) 147–62.

Kalm, Mart and Ingrid Ruudi, eds., *Constructed Happiness: Domestic Environment in the Cold War Era* (Tallinn, 2005).

Kampmann, Sabine, *Künstler sein: Systemtheoretische Beobachtungen von Autorschaft* (Munich, 2006).

Kapur, Geeta, *When was Modernism? Essays on Contemporary Cultural Practices in India* (New Delhi, 2000).

Karamanolakis, Vangelis, 'University of Athens and Archaeological Studies: The Contribution of Archaeology to the Creation of a National Past (1911–1932)', in *A Singular Antiquity: Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in Twentieth-Century Greece*, ed. Dimitris Damaskos and Dimitris Plantzos (Athens, 2008) 185–95.

Karlholm, Dan, *Handböckernas Konsthistoria: Om skapandet av 'allmän konsthistoria' i Tyskland under 1800-talet* (Stockholm, 1996).

——, 'Vetenskapens vardag', in *8 kapitel om konsthistoriens historia i Sverige*, ed. Britt-Inger Johansson and Hans Pettersson (Stockholm, 2000) 93–118.

Karling, Sten, *Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst der Renaissance und des Barocks in Estland* (Dorpat, 1943).

Karouzos, Hristos, 'Nikou Mpertu: Giotto', *Nea Estia* 10 (1931) 1169–171.

Karp, Ivan, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja, and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, eds., *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations* (Durham, NC, 2006).

Karsavinas, Levas, *Europos kultūros istorija*, 5 vols. (Kaunas, 1931–36).

Kębłowski, Janusz, ed., *Interpretacja dzieła sztuki: Studia i dyskusje* (Warsaw and Poznań, 1976).

Keevallik, Juta, Rein Loodus, and Lehti Viiroja, eds., *Tekste kunstist ja arhitektuurist: Texte über Kunst und Architektur*, 3 vols. (Tallinn, 2000–6).

Keliuotis, Juozas, *Meno tragizmas: Studija ir straipsniai apie literatūrą ir meną* (Vilnius, 1997).

Kelsey, Robin, *Archive Style*: *Photographs and Illustrations for US Surveys, 1850–1890* (Berkeley, CA, 2007).

Kemp, Wolfgang, 'Kontexte: Für eine Kunstgeschichte der Komplexität', *Texte zur Kunst* 2 (1991) 89–101.

Kempers, Bram, *Painting, Power and Patronage: The Rise of the Professional Artist in the Italian Renaissance*, trans. Bev Jackson (Harmondsworth, 1992).

Kennaway, George, 'Lithuanian Art and Music Abroad: English Reception of the Work of M.K. Čiurlionis, 1912–39', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 83.2 (2005) 234–53.

Kępiński, Zdzisław, 'Symbolika Drzwi Gnieźnieńskich', in *Drzwi Gnieźnieńskie*, ed. Michał Walicki (Wrocław, 1959) 161–318.

de Kerckhove, Derrick, *Brainframes: Technology, Mind and Busines*s (Utrecht, 1991).

Kessler, Erwin, 'Retro-garda', in *Culorile avangardei: Arta în România 1910–1950*, ed. Erwin Kessler (Bucharest, 2007) 5–34.

Kirby, Jo, 'Towards a new discipline?' in *Art Technology: Sources and Methods: Proceedings of the Second Symposium of Art Technological Source Research Study Group, Madrid 2007*, ed. Stefanos Kroustallis, Joyce H. Townsend, Elena Cenalmor Bruquetas, Ad Stijnman, and Margarita San Andres Moya (London, 2008) 7–15.

Kivy, Peter, *Philosophies of Art: An Essay in Differences* (Cambridge, 1997).

Kļaviņš, Eduards, 'Art History in Totalitarian Societies and its Alternative Models in Post-totalitarian Age', *Studija: Visual Arts Magazine* 6 (1999).

Klein, Bruno and Bruno Boerner, eds., *Stilfragen zur Kunst des Mittelalters: Eine Einführung* (Berlin, 2006)

Klotz, Heinrich and Martin Warnke, eds., *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1997–2000).

Kockel, Valentin, Brigitte Sölch, Martin Heise, and Eva-Maria Landwehr, eds., *Francesco Bianchini (1662–1729) und die europäische gelehrte Welt um 1700*, (Berlin, 2005).

Kodres, Krista, Juhan Maiste, and Vappu Vabar, eds., *Sten Karling and Baltic Art History* (Tallinn, 1999).

Kodres, Krista, Piet Lindpere, and Eva Näriepa, eds., *The Problem of Classical Ideal in the Art and Architecture of the Countries of the Baltic Sea* (Tallinn, 2003).

Kodres, Krista, ed., *Eesti kunsti ajalugu* (*History of Estonian Art*) *1520–1770*, 2 (Tallinn, 2005).

——, 'How to Write Art History: the Estonian Experience', *Acta Historiae Artium Balticae* 1 (2005) 5–13.

Kodres, Krista and Merike Kurisoo, eds., *Art and the Church: Religious Art and Architecture in the Baltic Sea Region in the 13th–18th Centuries* (Tallinn, 2008).

Koerner, Joseph Leo and Lisbet Rausing, 'Value', in *Critical Terms for Art History*, ed. Robert Nelson and Richard Shiff (Chicago, 2003) 419–34.

Koeva, Margarita, *Паметници на културата през Българското Възраждане: Архитектура и изкуство на българските църкви* (Sofia, 1977).

Kokkou, Aggeliki, *I merimna gia tis arheotites stin Ellada kai ta prota mouseia* (Athens, 1977).

Köksal, Aykut, 'Söyleşi: Prof. Dr Semavi Eyice ile', *Arredamento Dekorasyon* 14 (1990) 36–42.

Kolarić, Miodrag and Nikola Kusovac, eds., *Klasicizam kod Srba IV, Štampa iz razdoblja klasicizma o umetnosti* (Belgrade, 1967).

Kondakov, Nikodem, *Путешествие на Синай в 1881 г: Из путевых впечатлений.* Древности Синайского монастыря (Odessa, 1882).

——, *Археологическое путешествие по Сирии и Палестине* (St Petersburg, 1904).

——, *Македония: Археологическое путешествие* (St Petersburg, 1909).

——, *Иконография Богоматери*, т.I–II (St Petersburg, 1914–15).

Korka, Elena, Maria Xanthopoulou, and Eleni Konstantinidi-Syvridi, eds., *Xenes arheologikes scholes stin Ellada: 160 hronia/Foreign Archaeological Schools in Greece: 160 Years* (Athens, 2005).

Korka, Elena, *Xenes arheologikes scholes stin Ellada: apo ton 19° ston 21° eona* (Athens, 2007).

Korsakaitė, Ingrida and Irena Kostkevičiūtė, eds., *XX a. Lietuvių dailės istorija*, 3 vols. (Vilnius, 1982–1990).

——, *Lietuvos architektūros istorija*, 4 vols. (Vilnius, 1985–2000).

Koshukharov, Georgi, ed., *Архитектурата на първата и втората българска държава: Материали* (Sofia, 1975).

Kosuth, Joseph and Seth Siegelaub, 'Reply to Benjamin Buchloh on Conceptual Art', *October* 57 (1991) 152–7.

Kosuth, Joseph, 'Über das Spiel des Unsagbaren und des Unerwähnbaren', *Kunstforum International* 125 (1994) 63–7.

Kotidis, Antonis, *O zografos Konstantinos Maleas (1879–1928)* (PhD Dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1982).

——, *Modernismos ke "paradosi" stin elliniki tehni tou mesopolemou* (Thessaloniki, 1993).

Kotz, Liz, *Words to be looked at: Language in the 1960s Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2007).

Kowalczyk, Jerzy, 'Review of Kościoły i klasztory rzymskokatolickie dawnego województwa ruskiego, t. 1–11, ed. J.K. Ostrowski, Kraków 1993–2003, Materiały do dziejów sztuki sakralnej na Ziemiach Wschodnich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej, cz. I. Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury w Krakowie', *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* 66 (2004) 391–401.

Krása, Josef, *Die Handschriften König Wenzels IV* (Prague, 1971).

Krauss, Rosalind, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, MA, 1985).

——, *'A Voyage on the North Sea': Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition* (London, 1998).

Krieger, Verena, ed., *Kunstgeschichte & Gegenwartskunst: Vom Nutzen & Nachteil der Zeitgenossenschaft* (Cologne, 2008).

Krings, Katharina, *Die Berliner Museumsinsel: Museale Präsentation im historischen Wandel* (Norderstet, 2007).

Kristeva, Julia, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (Oxford, 1982).

Kroeber, Alfred L., *Style and Civilizations* (Ithaca, 1957).

Kroupa, Jiří, *Alchymie štěstí* (Brno, 1984; 2nd rev. edn. 2006).

Krull, Hasso, *Katkestuse kultuur* (Tallinn, 1996).

Krzović, Ibrahim, *Zbirka likovnih djela Bošnjaka 1988–2001* (Sarajevo, 2001).

——, *Arhitektura Secesije u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo, 2004).

Kubler, George, 'Style and the Representation of Historical Time', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 138/2, 2 (1967) 849–55.

——, 'Period, Style and Meaning in Ancient American Art', *New Literary History* 1.2, (1970) 127–44.

——, 'Towards a Reductive Theory of Visual Style', in *The Concept of Style*, ed. Berel Lang (Philadelphia, PA, 1979) 119–27.

Kugler, Franz, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1842).

Kuhn, Thomas, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL, 1964).

Kuizinas, Kęstutis and Julija Fomina, *ŠMC/CAC 1992–2007* (Vilnius, 2007).

Kukk, Inge, Laidi Laiverik, Ingrid Sahk, Jaanika Tiisvend, and Külli Valk, eds., *200 years of the Art Museum of the University of Tartu* (Tartu, 2006).

Kultermann, Udo, *Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte: Der Weg einer Wissenschaft* (Munich, 1990; first published Vienna and Dusseldorf, 1966).

——, *History of Art History* (New York, 1993).

Kunstverein Ruhr, ed., *Heimo Zobernig* (Essen, 2003).

Kusovac, Nikola, *Umetnička baština Srba u zapadnoj Slavoniji: Pakrac, Lisičine, Veliki Bastaji* (Belgrade, 1993).

Labuda, Adam S., 'Horyzont wielkopolski, horyzont europejski: Seminarium historii sztuki Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego 1919–1939', in *Dzieje storii sztuki w Polsce: Kształtowanie się instytucji naukowych w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. Adam S. Labuda (Poznań, 1996) 156–67.

Lacan, Jacques, *Ecrits: The First Complete Edition in English*, trans. Bruce Fink (New York, 2006).

Laclotte, Michel, *Histoires de musées: Souvenirs d'un conservateur* (Paris, 2003).

Ladendorf, Otto, *Historisches Schlagwörterbuch: Ein Versuch* (Berlin, 1906).

Lafuente Ferrari, Enrique, *Breve historia de la pintura española* (Madrid, 1934).

Lagoutte, Daniel, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 1997).

Lamberti, Maria Mimita, '1870–1915: I mutamenti del mercato e le ricerche degli artisti', *Storia dell'arte italiana* II.3 (Turin, 1982) 5–172.

Lamberti, Maria Mimita and Paolo Fossati, eds., *Felice Casorati: 1883–1963* (Milan, 1985).

Lamberti, Maria Mimita and Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco, eds., *Piero della Francesca e il Novecento, 1920–1938* (Venice, 1991).

Lambraki-Plaka, Marina, 'Anotati Scholi Kalon Tehnon: 150 hronia zois', in *Anotati Scholi Kalon Tehnon: Ekaton peninta hronia, 1837–1987* (Athens, 1990) 11–22.

Lamp, Ene, *Ekspressionism: Eesti Kujutavas Kunstis* (Tallinn, 2004).

Lampérez y Romea, Vicente, *Arquitectura civil española de los siglos I al XVIII* (Madrid, 1922).

Lancaster, Kevin, 'A new approach to consumer theory', *Journal of Political Economy* 74 (1966) 132–57.

Lanckorońska, Karolina, *Michelangelo in Ravensbrück: One Woman's War against the Nazis*, trans. Noel Clark (New York, 2008).

Landes, William and Richard Posner, *The Economic Structure of Intellectual Property Law* (Cambridge and MA, 2003).

Landow, George P., *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology* (Baltimore, MD, 1992).

Lang, Gladys Engel and Kurt Lang, 'Recognition and Renown: The Survival of Artistic Reputation', *American Journal of Sociology* 94.1 (1988) 79–109.

Lange, Julius, *Michelangelo og Marmoret* (Copenhagen, 1871).

——, *Om Kunstværdi* (Copenhagen, 1876).

——, *Billedkunstens Fremstilling af Menneskeskikkelsen i dens ældste Periode indtil Højdepunktet af den græske Kunst* (Copenhagen, 1892).

——, *Menneskefiguren i Kunstens Historie: Fra den græske Kunsts anden Blomstringstid indtil vort Aarhundrede* (Copenhagen, 1898).

——, *Thorwaldsen's Darstellung des Menschen* (Berlin, 1894).

——, *Die menschliche Gestalt in der Geschichte der Kunst von der zweiten Blütezeit der griechischen Kunst bis zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Strasbourg, 1903).

——, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 2 vols. (Strasbourg, 1911–12).

——, *Vom Kunstwert: Zwei Vorträge* (Zürich, 1925).

Lanzi, Luigi, *Storia pittorica della Italia dal Risorgimento delle Belle Arti fin presso al fine del XVIII secolo* (1795–96; 1809), ed. Martino Capucci (Florence, 1968).

Latour, Bruno and Peter Weibel, eds., *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2002).

Laučkaitė, Laima, *Vilniaus dailė XX amžiaus pradžioje* (Vilnius, 2002).

Laude, Jean, *La peinture française (1905–1914) et l'art nègre* (Paris, 1968).

——, 'Retour et/ou Rappel à l'ordre?' in *Le Retour à l'ordre dans les arts plastiques et l'architecture 1919–1925: Actes du second colloque d'Histoire de l'art contemporain, Université de Saint-Etienne, 15–16–17 février 1974* (Saint-Etienne, 1975) 7–44.

Lavalleye, Jacques and Paul Coremans, Preface to *Les Primitifs flamands: Le Musée communal de Bruges*, ed. Aquilin Janssens de Bisthoven and Remi Parmentier (Antwerp, 1951) V–VI.

Lavalleye, Jacques, *Juste de Gand: Peintre de Frédéric de Montefeltre* (Leuven, 1936).

——, *Le Palais Ducal d'Urbin: Les Primitifs flamands* (Brussels, 1964).

——, 'L'Institut Supérieur d'Archéologue et d'Histoire de l'Université catholique de Louvain', *Revue des archéologues et historiens d'art de Louvain* II (1969) 10–11.

Lebensztejn, Jean-Claude, *Annexes—de l'oeuvre d'art* (Paris, 1999).

Lehner, Ferdinand, *Dějiny umění národa českého* (Prague, 1903).

Lemoine, Serge, ed., *Histoire de l'art moderne et contemporain* (Paris, 2006).

Levi, Donata, *Cavalcaselle: Il pioniere della conservazione dell'arte italiana* (Turin, 1988).

Lévy, Pierre, *Qu'est-ce que le virtuel?* (Paris, 1995).

Lewis-Williams, David, *The Mind in the Cave: Consciousness and the Orgins of Art* (London, 2002).

Leyten, Harrie and Bibi Damen, eds., *Art, Anthropology and the Modes of Re-presentation: Museums and Contemporary Non-Western Art* (Amsterdam, 1993).

Lichtenstein, Jaqueline, *La Couleur éloquente: Rhétorique et peinture a l'âge classique* (Paris, 1993).

Lichtin, Christoph, *Das Künstlerinterview: Analyse eines Kunstprodukts* (Bern, 2004).

Lidov, Alexei, ed., *Kosovo-Christian Orthodox Heritage and Contemporary Catastrophe* (Moscow, 2007).

Lindfors, Johanna, 'Tancred Borenius: Our Man in England', in *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, ed. Renja Suominen-Kokkonen (Helsinki, 2007) 169–80.

Liverani, Paolo, 'The Museo Pio-Clementino at the time of the Grand Tour', *Journal of the History of Collections* 12.2 (2000) 151–9.

Locher, Hubert, 'Stilgeschichte und die Frage der "nationalen Konstante" ', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte* LIII (1996) 285–93.

——, *Kunstgeschichte als historische Theorie der Kunst 1750–1950* (Munich, 2nd edn., 2010) (first published 2001).

Lodoli, Carlo, *Elementi dell' architettura lodoliana, o sia, L'arte del fabbricare con solidità scientifica e con eleganza* (Rome, 1786).

Loir, Christophe, *L'émergence des Beaux-Arts en Belgique: Institutions, artistes, public et patrimoine (1773–1835)* (Brussels, 2004).

Loizidi, Niki, 'Isagogiki omilia', in *Prosengisis tis kallitehnikis dimiouryias apo tin Anagennisi eos tis meres mas*, ed. Nicos Daskalothanasis (Athens, 2008).

Longhi, Roberto, 'Proposte per una critica d'arte', *Paragone* I (1950) 1 and 5–16.

——, 'I pittori futuristi', *La Voce* 5.15 (April 10, 1913), in Longhi, *Opere complete*, I. *Scritti giovanili* (Florence, 1961) 47–54.

——, *Scultura futurista Boccioni* (Florence, 1914), in Longhi, *Opere complete*, I. *Scritti giovanili* (Florence, 1961) 133–62.

——, *Breve ma veridica storia della pittura italiana* (1914) (Milan, 3rd edn., 2001).

Lorente, Jesús Pedro, *Cathedrals of Urban Modernity: The First Museums of Contemporary Art, 1800–1930* (Aldershot, 1999).

Lorenz, Thuri, 'Polyklet: Die Geschichte vom "Kanon" ', in *Festschrift für Götz Pochat zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Johann Konrad Eberlein (Vienna, 2007) 11–19.

Luaces, Yarza, *Formas Artísticas de lo Imaginario* (Barcelona, 1987).

——, *Arte gótico* (Madrid, 1991).

Lubbock, John, *Pre-historic Times, as illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages* (London, 1865).

Lugli, Adalgisa, 'Inquiry as Collection: The Athanasius Kircher Museum in Rome', *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 12 (1986) 109–24.

Lukšionytė-Tolvaišienė, Nijolė, *Istorizmas ir modernas Vilniaus architektūroje*, Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis/Vilniaus dailės akademijos darbai. Dailė 18 (Vilnius, 2000).

Lumiste, Mai, *Tallinna Surmatants* (Tallinn, 1976).

Lunenfeld, Peter, *User: Infotechnodemo: Mediaworkbook* (Cambridge, MA, 2005).

Lyotard, Jean-François, *Discourse, Figure*, trans. Antony Hudek and Mary Lydon (Minneapolis, MN, 2010).

Maar, Christa and Hubert Burda, eds., *Iconic Turn: Die neue Macht der Bilder* (Cologne, 2004).

Macdonald, Murdo, *Scottish Art* (London, 2000).

Macdonald, Raymond A., 'The Styles of Art History: Entities or Processes?' *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 7.1 (1993) 48–63.

Mack, Rosamond E., *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300–1600* (Los Angeles, 2001).

Maclean, Gerald, *Reorienting the Renaissance: Cultural Exchanges with the East* (London, 2005).

Macmillan, Duncan, *Scottish Art, 1416–2000* (Edinburgh, 2000).

Mai, Ekkehard, Harald Siebenmorgen, and Rainer Sörries, 'Zur Lage der deutschen Museen', *Kunstchronik: Monatsschrift für Kunstwissenschaft, Museumswesen und Denkmalpflege* 57 (2004) 313–21.

Mairesse, François, 'Réflexion sur la balance des peintres de Roger de Piles', *Recherches Poïétiques* 8 (1999) 43–9.

——, *Le droit d'entrer au musée* (Brussels, 2005).

Mairesse, François and André Desvallees, eds., *Vers une redéfinition du musée?* (Paris, 2007).

Mairesse, François and Philippe Vanden Eeckaut, 'Museum Assessment and FDH Technology: Towards a Global Approach', *Journal of Cultural Economics* 26 (2002) 261–86.

Maiste, Juhan, *Eesti kunsti lugu* (Tallinn, 2008).

Mak, Geert, *In Europe: Travels Through the Twentieth Century* (London, 2007).

Makuljević, Nenad, *Umetnost i nacionalna ideja u XIX veku: sistem evropske i srpske vizuelne kulture u službi nacije* (Belgrade, 2006).

Maldiney, Henri, *Art et existence* (Paris, 2003).

Maleković, Vladimir, *Fotografija u Hrvatskoj 1848–1951* (Zagreb, 1994).

Małkiewicz, Adam, *Z dziejów polskiej historii sztuki: Studia i szkice* (Cracow, 2005).

——, 'History of Art at the Jagiellonian University 1882–2007', in *Historia sztuki na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim 1882–2007/History of Art at the Jagiellonian University 1882–2007* (Cracow, 2007) 13–21.

Malraux, André, *The Voices of Silence*, trans. Stuart Gilbert (New York, 1953).

——, *Museum without Walls*, trans. Stuart Gilbert and Francis Price (Garden City, NY, 1967).

Maltese, Corrado, 'Linguaggio analogico e linguaggio digitale', in *Il nuovo mondo dell'immagine elettronica*, ed. Guido and Teresa Aristarco (Bari, 1985) 27–36.

——, *Per una storia dell'immagine: Da Leonardo alla computer art* (Roma, 1989).

Mancusi-Ungaro, Carol, 'Embracing Humility in the Shadow of the Artist', in *Personal Viewpoints: Thoughts about Paintings Conservation*, ed. Mark Leonard (Los Angeles, 2003) 83–94.

Manovich, Lev, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, MA, 2001).

Mansfield, Elizabeth, 'Art History and Modernism', in *Art History and its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline*, ed. Elizabeth Mansfield (London and New York, 2002) 11–27.

Marazov, Ivan, *Мит, ритуал и изкуство в древна Тракия* (Sofia, 1992).

——, *Мит, ритуал и изкуство у траките* (Sofia, 1992).

——, *Видимият мит: Изкуство и митология* (Sofia, 1992).

——, *Митология на златото* (Sofia, 1994).

——, *Митология на траките* (Sofia 1994).

——, ed., *Ancient Gold: The Wealth of the Thracian Treasures from the Republic of Bulgaria* (New York, 1998).

——, *Тракийският войн* (Sofia, 2005).

Marcussen, Marianne, 'The Danish Art Historian Julius Lange: His Attitude to Trends in Art History in Europe and his Collaboration with Scandinavian Colleagues', in *Towards a Science of Art History: J.J. Tikkanen and Art Historical Scholarship in Europe*, ed. Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2009) 71–84.

Marek, Michaela, 'Kunstgeschichte zwischen Wissenschaft und Dienst am Staat', in *Grenzen überwindend: Festschrift für Adam S. Labuda*, ed. Katja Bernhardt and Piotr Piotrowski (Berlin, 2006) 79–97.

Marin, Louis, *Portrait of the King*, trans. Martha M. Houle (London, 1988).

——, *Des pouvoirs de l'image: gloses* (Paris, 1993).

——, 'L'œuvre d'art et les sciences sociales', in *Encyclopaedia Unversalis: Symposium: Les enjeux*, 2 (Paris, 1993) 947–71.

——, *Opacité de la peinture: Essais sur la représentation en Quattrocento* (Paris, 2nd edn., 2006) (first published 1989).

Marinska, Rusha, *20-те години в българското изобразително изкуство* (Sofia, 1996).

——, ed., *Sofia—Европа: Българската живопис (1900–1950) в контекста на европейското изкуство* (Sofia, 1999).

——, ed., *Гео Милев и българският модернизъм* (Sofia, 2005).

Marion, Jean-Luc, *La croisée du visible* (Paris, 2007).

Marjanović-Dušanić, Smilja and Danica Popović, eds., *Privatni život u srpskim zemljama srednjeg veka*, (Belgrade, 2004).

Marković, Miodrag, *Manastir Svetog Nikite kod Skoplja, istorija i živopis* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2004).

Martindale, Andrew, *The Rise of the Artist in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance* (London, 1972).

Martis, Adi and Jennifer Smit, *Arte: Dutch Caribbean Art: Beeldende kunst van de Nederlandse Antillen en Aruba* (Amsterdam, 2002).

Matějček, Antonín, *Dějiny umění*, 6 vols. (Prague, 1922–36).

——, *Dějiny umění v obrysech* (Prague, 1948).

Mateo Gómez, Isabel, *Diego Angulo Íñiguez, historiador del arte* (Madrid, 2001).

Matthiopoulos, Evgenios, *I simmetohi tis Ellada stin Biennale tis Venetias, 1934–1940* (PhD Dissertation, University of Crete, 1997).

——, 'I tehnokritiki sto Mesopolemo: Taseis kai epiroes sti theoria kai tin kritiki tis tehnis tin epohi tou Mesopolemou', *I Kathimerini—Epta Imeres*, (March 8, 1998) 6–9.

——, Dora Komini-Dialeti and Athina Ragia, eds., *Lexico Ellinon kallitehnon (Zografi, gliptes, haraktes, 16os–20os eonas)* (Athens, 2000).

——, 'Ideoloyia ke tehnokritiki ta hronia 1949–1967: ellinokentrismos, sosialistikos realismos, modernismos', in *1949–1967: I ekriktiki ikosaetia*, ed. Urania Kaiafa (Athens, 2002) 363–400.

——, 'I istoria tis tehnis sta oria tou ethnous', in *I istoria tis tehnis stin Ellada*, ed. Evgenios Matthiopoulos and Nicos Hadjinicolaou (Herakleion, 2003) 413–70.

Matušakaitė, Marija, *Portretas XVI–XVIII a. Lietuvoje* (Vilnius, 1984).

Mazlish, Bruce, 'An Introduction to Global History', in *Conceptualizing Global History*, ed. Bruce Mazlish and Ralph Buultjens (Boulder, CO, 1993) 1–24.

McCoy, Garnett, 'A Continued Story: Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Princeton University, and William C. Seitz', *Archives of American Art Journal* 21.3 (1981) 8–13.

McDonald, Lee Martin and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate: On the Origins and Formation of the Bible* (Peabody, MA, 2002).

Mavrodinov, Nikola, *Еднокорабната и кръстовидна църква по българските земи до края на XIV век* (Sofia, 1931).

——, *Старобългарската живопис* (Sofia, 1946).

——, *Новата българска живопис: История на българското изкуство от епохата на Паисия до освобождението и на българската живопис от Освобождението до наши дни* (Sofia, 1947).

——, *Изкуството на българското Възраждане* (Sofia, 1962).

McEvilley, Thomas, 'Doctor Lawyer Indian Chief: "Primitivism in 20th Century Art" at the Museum of Modern Art in New York', *Artforum International* 23 (November 1984) 54–61.

——, 'Marginalia: Thomas McEvilley on the Global Issue', *Artforum International* 28 (March 1990) 19–21.

McWilliam, Neil and June Hargrove, eds., *Nationalism and French Visual Culture, 1870–1914* (London and New Haven, CT, 2004).

von Mechel, Christian, *Verzeichniß der Gemälde der Kaiserlich Königlichen Bilder-Galerie in Wien* (Vienna, 1780).

Medaković, Dejan, *Serbischer Barock: Sakrale Kunst im Donauraum* (Vienna, Cologne and Weimar, 1991).

——, *Serben in Wien* (Novi Sad, 2001).

——, *Joseph II und die Serben* (Novi Sad, 2006).

Meiland, Jack, 'Originals, Copies, and Aesthetic Value', in *The Forger's Art: Forgery and the Philosophy of Art*, ed. Denis Dutton (Berkeley, CA, 1983) 115–30.

Meiss, Millard, *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death* (Princeton, NJ, 1951).

Mencl, Václav, *Česká architektura doby Lucemburské* (Prague, 1948).

——, *Lidová architektura v Československu* (Prague, 1980).

Menger, Pierre Michel, 'Artistic Labor Markets: Contingent Work, Excess Supply and Occupational Risk Management', in *The Handbook of the Economics of Arts and Culture*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and David Throsby (Amsterdam, 2006) 765–812.

Mercer, Kobena, ed., *Annotating Art's Histories*, 4 vols. (London, 2004–7).

Merenik, Lidija, *Ideološki modeli: srpsko slikarstvo 1945–1968* (Belgrade, 2001).

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, *The Visible and the Invisible*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Evanston, IL, 1969).

Merrifield, Mary M., *Original Treatises, Dating from the XIIth to the XVIIIth Centuries on the Art of Painting* (New York, 1999) (first published 1849).

Merriman, Nick, *Beyond the Glass Case: The Past, the Heritage and the Public* (Leicester, 1991).

Metzger, Rainer, ed., 'Über das Kanonische', *Kunstforum International* 162 (2002).

Michalski, Sergiusz, 'Jan Białostocki a ewolucja historii sztuki po roku 1945', in *Ars longa: Prace dedykowane pamięci profesora Jana Białostockiego*, ed. Maria Poprzęcka (Warsaw, 1999) 54–63.

Michaud, Eric, *Histoire de l'art: Une discipline à ses frontières* (Paris, 2005).

——, 'Nord et Sud: Du nationalisme et du racisme en histoire de l'art', in Michaud, *Histoire de l'art: Une discipline à ses frontières* (Paris, 2005) 49–84.

Michel, Régis, 'De la non-histoire de l'art: Plaidoyer pour la tolerance et le pluralisme dans une discipline hantée par la violence et l'exclusion', in *David contre David* 1, ed. Régis Michel (Paris, 1993) xiii–lxii.

——, ed., *Où en est l'interprétation de l'œuvre d'art?* (Paris, 2000).

Michels, Karen, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft: deutschsprachige Kunstgeschichte im amerikanischen Exil* (Berlin, 1999).

Mihailović, Radmila, *Uticaji moralizatorskih tema i školske drame na evropsku likovnu umetnost XVII i XVIII veka* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 1963).

Mijušković, Slobodan, *Od samodovoljnosti do smrti slikarstva: umetničke teorije (i prakse) ruske avangarde* (Belgrade, 1996).

——, *Alfred Hičkok: upotreba slikarstva* (Belgrade and Cetinje, 2005).

Mikov, Lyubomir, *Култова архитектура и изкуство на хетеродоксните мюсюлмани в България (XVI–XX век): Бекташи и къзълбаши* (Sofia, 2007).

Miles, Roger S. and Lauro Zavala, eds., *Towards the Museum of the Future: New European Perspectives* (London, 1994).

Millet, Catherine, *Le critique d'art s'expose* (Nîmes, 1995).

Millet, Gabriel, *Recherches sur l'iconographie de l'Evangile* (Paris, 1916).

Mirzoeff, Nicholas, ed., *The Visual Culture Reader* (London, 1998).

——, *An Introduction to Visual Culture* (London, 1999).

——, *Una introducción a la cultura visual*, trans. Paula García Segura (Madrid, 2003).

Misirli, Nelly, *Gyzis* (Athens, 1995).

Mitchell, Katharyne, 'Geographies of Identity: Multiculturalism Unplugged', *Progress in Human Geography* 28 (2004) 641–51.

Mitchell, William J.T., *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation* (Chicago, IL, 1994).

——, *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images* (Chicago, IL, 2005).

——, *Iconologie: Image, texte, idéologie*, trans. Maxime Boidy and Stéphanie Roth (Paris, 2009).

Miteva, Maria, *Decorative Art in Bulgaria in the Beginning of the Modern Age: Adopting the European Experience (End of the 19th-Beginning of the 20th century)* (PhD Dissertation, Sofia, 2009).

Mitra, Rajendralal, *The Antiquities of Orissa* (Calcultta, 1875).

Miyatev, Krastju, *Кръглата църква в Преслав* (Sofia, 1932).

——, *Преславската керамика* (Sofia, 1936).

Mojžišova, Iva, 'Avant-Garde Repercussions and the School of Applied Arts in Bratislava, 1928–1939', *Journal of Design History* 5.4 (1992) 273–9.

Mondzain, Marie-José, *Image, icône, économie: Les Sources byzantines de l'imaginaires contemporain* (Paris, 1998).

Montaner, Josep Maria, *Nouveaux musées: Espaces pour l'art et la culture* (Barcelona, 1990).

Montens, Valérie, *Le Palais des Beaux-Arts: La création d'un haut-lieu de culture à Bruxelles (1828–1945)* (Brussels, 2000).

Montias, John Michael, *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-economic Study of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton, NJ, 1982).

——, *Vermeer and His Milieu: A Web of Social History* (Princeton, NJ, 1989).

——, 'Quantitative Methods in the Analysis of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Inventories', in *Economics of the Arts: Selected Essays*, ed. Victor Ginsburgh and Pierre-Michel Menger (Amsterdam, 1996) 1–26.

Moog-Grünewald, Maria, ed., *Kanon und Theorie* (Heidelberg, 1997).

Morelli, Giovanni, *Die Werke italienischer Meister in den Galerien München, Dresden und Berlin* (Leipzig, 1880).

——, *Italian Masters in German Galleries: A Critical Essay on the Italian Pictures in the Galleries of Munich, Dresden and Berlin*, trans. Louise M. Richter (London, 1883).

——, *Kunstkritische Studien über italienische Malerei: Die Galerien Borghese und Doria Pamphilj in Rom* (Leipzig, 1890).

Morgenstern, Karl, *Grundriss einer Einleitung zur Ästhetik mit Andeutungen zur Geschichte derselben* (Dorpat, 1915).

Mosquera, Gerardo, ed., *Beyond the Fantastic: Contemporary Art Criticism from Latin America* (London, 1995).

Motherwell, Robert, *The Collected Writings of Robert Motherwell*, ed. Stephanie Terenzio (Los Angeles, 1999).

Moulin, Raymonde, *Le Marché de la peinture en France* (Paris, 1967).

——, ed., *Sociologie des arts* (Paris, 1986).

Moxey, Keith, 'Visual Studies and the Iconic Turn', *Journal of Visual Culture* 7.2 (2008) 131–46.

Mülayim, Selçuk, 'Sanat Tarihinin Attilası Josef Strzygowski', *Sanat Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 8 (1989) 65–69.

Mulevičiūtė, Jolita, Giedrė Jankevičiūtė, and Lijana Šatavičiūtė, eds., *Dailės žodynas* (Vilnius, 1999).

——, ed., *Modernity and Identity: Art in 1918–1940* (Vilnius, 2000).

——, *Modernizmo link: Dailės gyvenimas Lietuvos Respublikoje 1918–1940* (Kaunas, 2001).

Mulholland, Neil, *The Cultural Devolution: Art in Britain in the late Twentieth Century* (Aldershot, 2003).

Muñoz y Manzano, Cipriano, *Adiciones al 'Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de Bellas Artes en España' de Cean Bermudez* (Madrid, 1889–94).

Muñoz-Viñas, Salvador, 'Beyond Authenticity', in *Art Conservation and Authenticities: Material, Concept, Context*, ed. Erma Hermens and Tina Fiske (London, 2009) 33–39.

Murzyn, Monika, *Kasimierz: The Central European Experience of Urban Regeneration* (Cracow, 2006).

——, 'Heritage Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, ed. Brian Graham and Peter Howard (Aldershot, 2008) 315–46.

Mutafov, Emanuel, *Европеизация на хартия*, (Sofia, 2001).

Mutafov, Emanuel, Ivanka Gergova, Alexander Kujumdzhiev, Elena Popova, Elena Genova and Dimitrios Gonis, *Гръцки зографи в България след 1453 г./ΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ ΑΓΙΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ ΣΤΗ ΒΟΥΛΓΑΡΙΑ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΟΥ 1453* (Sofia, 2008).

Nadolny, Jilleen, 'The First Century of Published Scientific Analyses of the Materials of Historical Painting and Polychromy, circa 1780–1880', *Reviews in Conservation* 4 (2003) 39–51.

——, 'A Problem of Methodology: Merrifield, Eastlake and the Use of Oil-based Media by Medieval English Painters', in *ICOM 14th Triennial Meeting, The Hague: 12–16 September 2005*, ed. Isabelle Verger (London, 2005) 1028–33.

Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Ground of the Image*, trans. Jeff Fort (New York, 2005).

Narušytė, Agnė, *Nuobodulio estetika Lietuvos fotografijoje* (Vilnius, 2008).

Nash, Catherine, 'Postcolonial Geographies: Spatial Narratives of Inequality and Interconnection', in *Envisioning Human Geography*, ed. Paul Cloke, Phil Crang, and Mark Goodwin (London, 2004) 104–27.

Neckenig, Franz, *Stil-Geschichte der Kunst: eine ganzheitliche Methode* (Berlin, 2010).

Nelson, Robert S. and Richard Shiff, eds., *Critical Terms for Art History* (Chicago, IL, 1996).

Neshov, N., 'Старите и новите художествени направления в Архитектурата', *БИАД* 8, 9 and 10 (1899) 207–9; 11 and 12 (1899) 276–7.

Neues Museum Weserburg Bremen, *MINIMAL MAXIMAL: Die Minimal Art und ihr Einfluss auf die Kunst der 90er Jahre* (Heidelberg, 1998).

Neumann, Jaromír, *Die Gemäldegalerie der Prager Burg* (Prague, 1964).

——, *Das böhmische Barock* (Prague, 1970).

——, ed., *Renaissance Art in Bohemia* (Prague, 1979).

Neumann, Wilhelm, 'Baltische Kunstzustände 1775–1825', in *Eesti Kirjameeste Seltsi aastaraamat 1881*, ed. Mihkel Veske (Tartu, 1881) 281–92.

——, *Grundriss einer Geschichte der bildenden Künste und des Kunstgewerbes in Liv-, Est- und Kurland vom Ende des 12. bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Reval, 1887).

——, *Baltische Maler und Bildhauer des XIX. Jahrhunderts: Biographische Skizzen mit den Bildnissen der Künstler und Reproduktionen nach ihren Werken* (Riga, 1902).

Newman, Barnett, 'The Sublime is Now', article for *Tiger's-Eye* (December, 1948), in *Barnett Newman: Selected Writings and Interviews*, ed. John P. O'Neill (New York, 1990) 170–3.

Nicholas, Lynn H., *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York, 1995).

Niculescu, Elena, 'Remus Niculescu: Aperçu biographique', *Revue roumaine d'histoire de l'art* 43 (2007) 7–29.

Nikolaeva, Anelia and Denitsa Kiseler, *Българските художници и Мюнхен: Модерни практики от средата на XIX до средата на XX век: Каталог* (Sofia, 2009).

Nixon, Mignon, *Fantastic Reality: Louise Bourgeois and the Story of Modern Art* (Cambridge, MA, 2005).

Nochlin, Linda, 'Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?' (1971) in Nochlin, *Women, Art, and Power and Other Essays* (New York, 1988) 145–78.

——, *Femmes, art et pouvoir*, trans. Oristelle Bonis (Nîmes, 1993).

Nõmmela, Mari, *Voldemar Vaga (1899–1999) ja eesti kunsti ajalugu* (Tartu, 2008).

Obretenov, Aleksandar, *Формиране и развитие на социалистическата култура в България* (Sofia, 1971).

——, ed., *Енциклопедия на изобразителните изкуства в България*, 3 vols. (Sofia, 1980–2006).

Odobescu, Alexandru, *Istoria Archeologiei* (Bucharest, 1877).

O'Doherty, Brian, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (Los Angeles, 1986; exp. edn. 1999).

O'Hagan, John, *The State and the Arts: An Analysis of Key Economic Issues in Europe and the United States* (Cheltenham, 1998).

Olin, Margaret, 'Alois Riegl: The Late Roman Empire in the Late Habsburg Empire', *Austrian Studies* 5 (1994) 107–20.

Omlin, Sibylle, *Kunst aus der Schweiz: Kunstschaffen und Kunstsystem im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Zürich, 2002).

Onians, John, 'World Art Studies and the Need for a New Natural History of Art', *Art Bulletin* 78.2 (1996) 206–9.

——, ed., *Atlas of World Art* (London, 2004).

——, ed., *Compression vs. Expression: Containing the World's Art* (New Haven, CT, 2007).

——, *Neuroarthistory: From Aristotle and Pliny to Baxandall and Zeki* (New Haven, CT, 2007).

D'Onofrio, Mario, ed., *Adolfo Venturi e la storia dell'arte oggi* (Modena 2008).

Oosterling, Henk, 'Sens(a)ble Intermediality and Interesse: Towards an Ontology of the In-Between', *Intermédialités* 1.1 (2003) 29–46.

Oppel, Herbert, 'Kanon: Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula—norma)', *Philologus* 30.4 (1937).

Oroveanu, Anca, *Teoria europeană a artei şi psihanaliza* (Bucharest, 2000).

Orton, Fred and Griselda Pollock, 'Les Données Bretonnantes: La Prairie de Représentation', *Art History* 3.3 (1980) 314–88.

——, 'Memories still to come…', in Orton and Pollock: *Avant-Gardes and Partisans Reviewed* (Manchester, 1996) i–xxi.

Otto-Dorn, Katharina and Mehmet Önder, 'Bericht über die Grabung in Kobadabad 1965', *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 81 (1966) 170–83.

Palagia, Olga, 'Ludovikos Ross: O protos kathigitis arheologias tou Panepistimiou Athinon, 1837–1843' in *Ludwig Ross in Greece, Proceedings of the International Symposium*, Athens, 2–3 October 2002, ed. Hans Rupprecht Goette and Olga Palagia (Rahden, Westphalia, 2005) 263–73.

Paliušytė, Aistė, ed., *Lietuvos dailininkų žodynas. I: XVI–XVIII a.*, (Vilnius, 2005).

Panofsky, Erwin, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (New York, 1951).

——, '"Renaissance": Self-Definition or Self-Deception?' in Erwin Panofsky and Lena I. Gedin, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (Stockholm, 1965) 1–41.

——, *Estudios sobre iconología*, trans. Bernardo Fernández (Madrid, 1972).

——, *Three Essays on Style*, ed. Irving Lavin (Cambridge, MA, 1995).

——, 'Das Problem des Stils in der bildenden Kunst' (1915), in *Deutschsprachige Aufsätze, II*, ed. Karen Michels and Martin Warnke (Berlin, 1998) 1009–18.

Parker, Roszika and Griselda Pollock, *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology* (London, 1981).

Parsons, Glenn and Allen Carlson, 'New Formalism and the Aesthetic Appreciation of Nature', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 62.4 (2004) 363–76.

Passeron, Jean-Claude, 'La sociologie de la réception des œuvres dans ses rapports à la théorie de l'art et à la sémiologie de l'art', *Journées de l'EHESS, Montrouge-Marseille* (1987) 29–48

de Patoul, Brigitte and Roger Van Schoute, eds., *Les Primitifs flamands et leur temps* (Tournai, 1994).

Pavel, Amelia, *Idei estetice şi arta românească la răscruce de veac* (Bucharest, 1972).

Peacock, Alan and Charles Godfrey, 'The Economics of Museums and Galleries', *Lloyds Bank Review* 111 (1974) 17–28.

Peacock, Alan and Ilde Rizzo, *The Heritage Game: Economics, Policy and Practice* (Oxford, 2008).

Peckham, Robert S., 'Introduction: The Politics of Heritage and Public Culture', in *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe*, ed. Robert S. Peckham (London, 2003) 1–13.

Pérez Sánchez, Alfonso E., *La nature morte espagnole du XVIIᵉ siècle à Goya* (Fribourg, 1987).

——, *Pintura barroca en España, 1600–1750* (Madrid, 1992).

Petković, Sreten, *Zidno slikarstvo na području Pećke patrijaršije 1557–1614* (Novi Sad, 1965).

——, *Srpski svetitelji u slikarstvu pravoslavnih naroda* (Novi Sad, 2007).

Petković, Vladimir, *L'art dalmate du moyen âge* (Paris, 1919).

——, *La Peinture serbe du Moyen Âge*, 2 vols. (Belgrade, 1930–1934).

Petrakos, Vasilios, *I en Athines Arheologiki Eteria: I istoria ton 150 hronon tis, 1837–1987* (Athens, 1987).

Petranu, Coriolan, *Ars Transsilvaniae: Études d'histoire de l'art transylvain; Studien zur Kunstgeschichte Siebenbürgens* (Sibiu, 1944).

Petrov, Petar, Katharina Gehl, and Klaus Roth, eds., *Fremdes Europa? Selbstbilder und Europa-Vorstellungen in Bulgarien (1850–1945)* (Berlin, 2007).

Pétry, Claude, *L'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 2005).

Pettersson, Hans, *Gregor Paulsson och den konsthistoriska tolkningens problem* (Stockholm and Stehag, 1997).

——, 'Konsthistoria som universitetsdisciplin', in *8 kapitel om konsthistoriens historia i Sverige*, ed. Britt-Inger Johansson and Hans Pettersson (Stockholm, 2000) 63–91.

Pettersson, Susanna, 'For the People's Best: Frederik Cygnaeus and the Course taken by Art in Finland', in *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, eds. Renja Suominen-Kokkonen and Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2007) 11–24.

——, *Suomen Taideyhdistyksestä Ateneumiin: Fredrik Cygnaeus, Carl Gustaf Estlander ja taidekokoelman roolit* (Helsinki, 2008).

Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Academies of Art: Past and Present* (Cambridge, 1940).

——, 'On Not Teaching Art History', *The Listener* (October 30, 1952).

——, *The Englishness of English Art* (London, 1956).

Pfisterer, Ulrich, ed., *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft: Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe* (Stuttgart, 2003).

——, ed., *Klassiker der Kunstgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Munich, 2007 and 2008).

——, 'Origins and Principles of World Art History: 1900 (and 2000)', in *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, ed. Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme (Amsterdam, 2008) 69–89.

Philippe, Joseph, *L'Evangéliaire de Notger et la chronologie de l'art mosan des époques préromane et romane (miniatures, ivoires, orfèvreries)* (Brussels, 1956).

Philippot, Paul, *Jalons pour une méthode critique et une histoire de l'art en Belgique* (Brussels, 2005).

de Piles, Roger, *Abregé de la vie des peintres. Avec des reflexions sur leurs ouvrages et un traité du Peintre parfait etc.* (Paris, 1699).

——, *Cours de peinture par principes* (1708) (Paris, 1992).

Pinder, Wilhelm, *Das Problem der Generation in der Kunstgeschichte Europas* (Berlin, 1926).

Pinelli, Orietta Rossi, *Arte di frontiera: Pittura e identità nazionale nell'Ottocento nord-americano* (Rome, 1996).

Pinto, Sandra, 'La promozione delle arti negli Stati italiani dall'età delle riforme all'Unità', in *Storia dell'arte italiana* II.2, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin 1979) 793–1060.

Pinto, Sandra and Matteo Lafranconi, *Gli storici dell'arte e la peste* (Milan, 2006).

Pirenne, Henri, *Histoire de la Belgique* (Brussels, 1929).

von Pistohlkors, Gert, ed., *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas*, 10: "Baltische Länder" (Berlin, 1994).

Piwocki, Ksawery, 'Lwowskie środowisko historyków sztuki', *Folia Historiae Artium* 4 (1967) 119–20.

——, *Pierwsza nowoczesna teoria sztuki: Poglądy Aloisa Riegla* (Warsaw, 1970).

Plekhanov, Georgyi, *Art and Social Life*, ed. Andrew Rothenstein, trans. Eric Hartley and Eleanor Fox (London, 1953).

Plesters, Joyce, 'The Preparation and Study of Paint Cross-Sections', *The Museums Journal* 54.4 (1954) 97–101.

——, 'Cross-Sections and Chemical Analysis of Paint Samples', *Studies in Conservation* 2.3 (1956) 110–57.

Ploom, Ulla, *Eesti Kunstimuuseum and selle varad aastatel 1919–1940*, Bakalaureusetöö, Estonia Artiakadeemia (Tallinn, 1998).

Pochat, Götz, 'Der Epochenbegriff und die Kunstgeschichte', in *Kategorien und Methoden der deutschen Kunstgeschichte 1900–1930*, ed. Lorenz Dittmann (Stuttgart, 1985).

Podro, Michael, *The Critical Historians of Art* (London and New Haven, CT, 1982; 2nd edn. 1983).

Poinsot, Jean-Marc, 'Discours actuels sur l'histoire de l'art du XXe siècle: Ecrire en mots ou en objets', *Perspective* 3 (2007) 490–501.

Poklewski, Józef, 'Katedra Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Stefana Batorego w Wilnie 1922–1939', in *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce: ksztaltowanie się instytucji naukowych w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. Adam S. Labuda (Poznań, 1996) 203–12.

Pollock, Griselda, *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism and Histories of Art* (London, 1988).

——, *Avant-Garde Gambits: Colour and the Gender of Art History* (London, 1993).

——, *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories* (London and New York, 1999).

——, ed., *Psychoanalysis and the Image* (Boston, MA, and Oxford, 2006).

——, 'Thinking Sociologically/Thinking Aesthetically: Between Convergence and Difference with some reflections on Sociology and Art History', *History of the Human Sciences* 20.2 (2007) 141–75.

Pomian, Krzysztof, 'L'art entre le musée et le marché', in *Le commerce de l'art de la Renaissance à nos jours*, ed. Laurence Bertrand Dorléac (Besançon, 1992) 9–33.

Pommier, Edouard, *Histoire et théories de l'art: De Winckelmann à Panofsky* (Paris, 1994).

——, ed., *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art, XVIIIe et XIXe siècles* (Paris, 1997).

Pop, Ioan, *The Romanians and Romania: A Brief History* (New York, 2000).

Popa, Corina and Ioana Iancovescu, *Mânăstirea Hurezi* (Bucharest 2009).

Popa, Corina, 'Biserici gotice târzii din jurul Bistriţei', in *Pagini de veche artă românească*, ed. Institutul de Istoria Artei (Bucharest, 1970) 313–17.

Popescu, Carmen, *Le style national roumaine: Construire une nation à travers l'architecture 1881–1945* (Rennes, 2004).

Popov, Chavdar and Svilen Stefanov, *Съвременната българска живопис: Между локалното и глобалното* (Sofia, 2004).

——, eds., *Between Traditions and Innovations: The Bulgarian Art of the 90s* (Sofia, 2003).

Popov, Chavdar, *Тоталитарното изкуство: Идеология: Организация: Практика* (Sofia, 2004).

——, *Постмодернизмът и българското изкуство от 80-те-90-те години н XX век* (Sofia, 2009).

Popov, D.G., 'Въпросът за националната ни архитектура', *БИАД* 14 (1923) 241.

Popović, Danica, *Srpski vladarski grob u srednjem veku* (Belgrade, 1992).

——, *Pod okriljem svetosti: kult svetih vladara i relikvija u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji* (Belgrade, 2006).

Porębski, Mieczysław, 'Sztuka a informacja', *Rocznik historii sztuki* 3 (1962) 44–111.

——, *Ikonosfera* (Warsaw, 1972).

——, *Sztuka a informacja* (Cracow, 1986).

Portús y Jesusa Vega, Javier, *Cossío, Lafuente, Gaya Nuño: El descubrimiento del arte español: Tres apasionados maestros* (Nivola, 2004).

Porumb, Marius, *Icoane din Maramureş* (Cluj-Napoca, 1975).

——, *Un veac de pictură românească din Transilvania: Secolul XVIII* (Bucharest 2003).

——, *Ştefan cel Mare şi Transilvania: Legături culturale şi artistice moldo-transilvane în sec. XV–XVI* (Cluj-Napoca, 2004).

Poulot, Dominique, *Musée, Nation, Patrimoine (1789–1815)* (Paris, 1997).

——, 'Quelle place pour la "question du public" dans le domaine des musées?' in *Le(s) public(s) de la culture*, ed. Olivier Donnat and Paul Tolilla (Paris, 2003) 103–23.

——, *Une histoire des musées de France, XVIIIème–XXème siècles* (Paris, 2005).

Poulsen, Hanne Kolind, 'Fra Ånd til Videnskab: Julius Lange og positivismen', in *Viljen til det menneskelige: Tekster omkring Julius Lange*, ed. Hans Dam Christensen, Hanne Kolind Poulsen, and Peter Nørgaard Larsen (Copenhagen, 1999) 67–86.

Prange, Regine, *Die Geburt der Kunstgeschichte: Philosophische Ästhetik und empirische Wissenschaft* (Cologne, 2004).

Preiss, Pavel, *Panoráma manýrismu* (Prague, 1974).

Previtali, Giovanni, *La fortuna dei primitivi* (Turin, 1964).

——, *Giotto e la sua bottega* (Milan, 1967).

——, 'La periodizzazione dell'arte italiana' in *Storia dell'arte italiana* I.1, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin 1979), 5–95.

——, ed., *L'arte di scrivere sull'arte: Roberto Longhi nella cultura del nostro tempo* (Rome, 1982).

——, 'The Periodization of Italian Art History', in *History of Italian Art* II, trans. Claire Dorey (Cambridge, 1994) 1–118.

Preziosi, Donald, ed., *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology* (Oxford and New York, 1998).

——, *Brain of the Earth's Body: Art, Museums and the Phantasms of Modernity* (Minneapolis, MN, 2003).

Probst, Jörg and Jost Phillip Klenner, eds., *Ideengeschichte der Bildwissenschaft: Siebzehn Porträts* (Frankfurt am Main, 2009).

Prokopiou, Angelos, *Neoelliniki tehni* (Athens, 1936).

——, *Istoria tis tehnis, 1750–1950* (Athens, 1967–69).

Prolović, Jadranka, *Die Kirche des Heiligen Andreas an der Treska: Geschichte, Architektur und Malerei einer palaiologenzeitlichen Stiftung des serbischen Prinzen Andreaš* (Vienna, 1997).

Protić, Miodrag B., *Srpsko slikarstvo XX veka* (Belgrade, 1970).

——, ed., *Počeci jugoslovenskog modernog slikarstva:1900–1920* (Belgrade, 1972).

——, ed., *Jugoslovenska skulptura: 1870–1950* (Belgrade, 1975).

——, ed. *Jugoslovenska grafika: 1900–1950* (Belgrade, 1977).

——, ed., *Jugoslovensko slikarstvo šeste decenije* (Belgrade, 1980).

Protich, Andrei, *Петдесет години българско изкуство* (Sofia, 1934).

——, 'Югозападната школа в българската стенопис', in *Сборник в чест на Васил Златарски* (Sofia, 1925) 243–91.

——, 'Денационализация и възраждане на нашето изкуство от 1393 до 1879 г.', *България 1000 години, 927–1927* (Sofia, 1930) 383–440.

Purvītis, Vilhelms, ed., *Mākslas vēsture*, 3 vols. (Riga, 1934–36).

Putnam, James, *Art and Artifact: The Museum as Medium* (London, 2001).

Puttfarken, Thomas, *Roger de Piles' Theory of Art* (New Haven, CT, 1985).

Raam, Villem, *Gooti puuskulptuur Eestis* (Tallinn, 1976).

——, ed., *Eesti Arhitektuuri Leksikon*, 4 vols. (Tallinn, 1993–99).

Rabineau, Isabelle, ed., *Dans l'œil du critique: Bernard Lamarche-Vadel et les artistes*, exhibition catalogue (Paris, 2009).

Račiūnaitė, Tojana, *Vizijos ir atvaizdai: Basųjų karmelitų palikimas* (Vilnius, 2003).

Radojčić, Svetozar, *Portreti srpskih vladara u srednjem veku* (Skopje, 1934).

——, *Staro srpsko slikarstvo* (Belgrade, 1966).

——, *Geschichte der serbischen Kunst: Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1969).

——, *Odabrani članci i studije 1933–1978* (Belgrade and Novi Sad, 1982).

Radujko, Milan, *Episkopski presto u Srbiji srednjeg veka* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2007).

Ragghianti, Carlo Ludovio, ed., *Arte moderna in Italia, 1915–1935* (Florence, 1967).

Rainov, Nikolai, 'Графиката на Николай Павлович', *Годишник на Народната библиотека в Пловдив, 1922* (Sofia, 1925).

——, *История на пластичните изкуства*, 12 vols. (Sofia, 1931–39).

Ramírez Domínguez, Juan Antonio, *Cómo escribir sobre arte y arquitectura* (Barcelona, 1996).

Ramonienė, Dalia, *Justinas Vienožinskis* (Vilnius, 2004).

Rampley, Matthew, 'L'Art considéré comme système social: Observations sur la sociologie de l'art de Niklas Luhmann', *Sociologie de l'art-Opus* 7 (2005) 159–85.

——, 'Visual Culture and the Meanings of Culture', in *Exploring Visual Culture: Definitions, Concepts, Contexts*, ed. Matthew Rampley (Edinburgh, 2005) 5–17.

Rancière, Jacques, *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*, trans. Gabriel Rockhill (New York, 2006).

——, *The Future of the Image*, trans. Gregory Elliott (London, 2009).

Rashenov, Alexander, *Месемврийските църкви* (Sofia, 1932).

Raspe, Rudolf E., *A Critical Essay on Oil Painting, proving that the Art of Painting in Oil was known before the pretended Discovery of John and Hubert van Eyck; to which are added, Theophilus De Arte Pingendi* (London, 1781).

Rätsep, Mare, *Kunstikogude saatusest Eestis aastatel 1920–1940*, Bakalaureusetöö, Tartu Ülikool (Tartu, 1996).

Raz, Ram, *Essay on the Architecture of the Hindus* (London, 1834).

Recht, Roland, *L'objet de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 2003).

——, *A quoi sert l'histoire de l'art?* (Paris, 2006).

——, *Penser le patrimoine*: *Mise en scène et mise en ordre de l'art* (Paris, 2008).

——, Philippe Sénéchal, Claire Barbillon, and François-René Martin, eds., *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art en France au XIXᵉ siècle* (Paris, 2008).

——, 'Remarques liminaires', in *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art en France au XIXᵉ siècle*, ed. Roland Recht, Philippe Sénéchal, Claire Barbillon, and François-René Martin (Paris, 2008) 7–15.

Rehkämper, Klaus and Klaus Sachs-Hombach, eds., *Bildgrammatik: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Syntax bildlicher Darstellungsformen* (Cologne, 1999).

Reitlinger, Gerald, *The Economics of Taste: The Rise and Fall of the Picture Market, 1760–1960* (London, 1961).

Rerup, Lorenz, 'Fra litterær til politisk nationalism: Udvikling og udbredelse fra 1808 til 1845', in *Dansk identitetshistorie* 2, ed. Ole Feldbæk (Copenhagen, 1991) 325–90.

Riana y Montero, Juan Facundo, *The Industrial Arts in Spain* (London, 1879).

Rice, David Talbot, *English Art 871–1100* (Oxford, 1952).

Richter, Václav, 'Die Anfänge der grossmährischen Architektur', *Magna Moravia* (Prague, 1965) 121–358.

——, *Umění a svět* (Prague, 2000).

Richter-Sherman, Claire and Adele M. Holcombe, *Women Interpreters of the Visual Arts 1820–1979* (London, 1981).

Riegl, Alois, 'Der moderne Denkmalkultus, sein Wesen, seine Entstehung' (1903), engl. transl. 'The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin', *Oppositions* 25 (1982) 21–51.

——, *Problems of Style* (1893), trans. Evelyn Kain (Princeton, NJ, 1992).

Rifkin, Adrian, 'Marx's Clarkism', *Art History* 8.4 (December 1985) 488–95.

——, 'Art's Histories', in *The New Art History*, ed. Alan L. Rees and Frances Borzello (London, 1986) 157–63.

Ristović, Milan, ed., *Privatni život kod Srba u dvadesetom veku* (Belgrade, 2007).

Rivière, Georges Henri, *La Muséologie selon Georges Henri Rivière: Cours de muséologie: Textes et témoignages* (Paris, 1989).

Rochlitz, Rainer, 'Stratégies de l'histoire de l'art', *Critique* Special Issue 586 (1996) 131–37.

——, 'La querelle de l'art contemporain', *Critique* 64 (1998) 99–120.

——, *Subversion and Subsidy: Contemporary Art and Aesthetics*, trans. Dafydd Roberts (Chicago, IL, 2008).

Rogoff, Irit, *Terra Infirma: Geography's Visual Culture* (London, 2000).

Romano, Giovanni, 'Pietro Toesca a Torino' (1996), in Romano, *Storie dell'arte: Toesca, Longhi, Wittkower, Previtali* (Rome, 1998) 1–21.

Römer, Stefan, *Künstlerische Strategien des Fake: Kritik von Original und Fälschung* (Cologne, 2001).

Roodhouse, Simon, *Cultural Quarters: Principles and Practice* (Bristol, 2006).

Roosvall, Johnny, *Den baltiska Nordens kyrkor* (Uppsala, 1924).

——, ed., *XIIIe Congrès international d'histoire de l'art, Stockholm 4–7 septembre 1933* (Stockholm, 1933).

Rose, Gillian, 'Place and Identity: A Sense of Place', in *A Place in the World? Place, Cultures and Globalization*, ed. Doreen Massey and Pat Jess (Oxford, 1995) 87–132.

Rosen, Sherwin, 'The Economics of Superstars', *American Economic Review* 71 (1981) 845–58.

Rosenfelt, Alla and Norton T. Dodge, eds., *From Gulag to Glasnost: Nonconformist Art from the Soviet Union* (New York and London, 1995).

Rothkopf, Scott, 'Krauss and the Art of Cultural Controversy: Interview with Rosalind Krauss', *The Harvard Crimson* (May 1997).

Rush, Michael, *New Media in Late 20th-Century Art* (New York, 1999).

Rusina, Ivan and Zora Rusinová, eds., *Dejiny slovenského výtvarného umenia*: *Barok* (Bratislava, 1998).

Rusinová, Zora, Ján Ábelovský, Katarína Bajcurová, Vladimír Beskid, Dana Bořutová, Matúš Dulla, Jana Geržová, Aurel Hrabušický, Silvia Ilečková, and Beata Jablonská, eds., *Dejiny slovenského výtvarného umenia*: *20. storočie* (Bratislava, 2000).

Ruskin, John, *A Joy Forever* (1857) (London, 1904).

——, 'The Accumulation and Distribution of Art', II, (Manchester, 1867), in Ruskin, *A Joy Forever* (London, 1904) 70–150.

——, *Unto this Last* (1862) (London, 1985).

Rykwert, Joseph, *The First Moderns: Architects of the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1980).

Ryle, Gilbert, 'Systematically Misleading Expressions' (1932), in Ryle, *Collected Papers* 2 (London, 1971) 39–62.

de Sabbata, Massimo, *Tra diplomazia e arte: Le Biennali di Antonio Maraini, 1928–1942* (Udine, 2006).

Sachs, Angeli and Vittorio Lampugnani, eds., *Museums for a New Millennium: Concepts, Projects, Buildings* (Munich, London and New York 1999).

Sachs-Hombach, Klaus and Klaus Rehkämper, eds., *Bild—Bildwahrnehmung—Bildverarbeitung* (Magdeburg, 1998).

Sachs-Hombach, Klaus, *Philosophische Psychologie im 19. Jahrhundert: Ihre Entstehung und Problemgeschichte* (Freiburg, 1993).

——, ed., *Bilder im Geiste: Zur kognitiven und erkenntnistheoretischen Funktion piktorialer Repräsentationen* (Amsterdam, 1995).

——, *Das Bild als kommunikatives Medium: Elemente einer allgemeinen Bildwissenschaft* (Köln, 2005).

——, ed., *Bildwissenschaft: Disziplinen, Themen, Methoden* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005).

——, ed., *Bildtheorien: Anthropologische und kulturelle Grundlagen des Visualistic Turn* (Frankfurt am Main, 2009).

——, ed., *Bild und Medium: Kunstgeschichtliche und philosophische Grundlagen der inter-disziplinären Bildwissenschaft* (Cologne, 2009).

Said, Edward, *Orientalism* (London, 1978).

——, *Culture and Imperialism* (London, 2003).

Salomon, Nanette, 'The Art Historical Canon: Sins of Omission', in *(En)gendering Knowl-edge: Feminists in Academe*, ed. Joan E. Hartman and Ellen Messer-Davidow (Knoxville, TN, 1991) 222–36.

Salvini, Roberto, ed., *La critica d'arte della pura visibilità e del formalismo* (Milan, 1977).

Samek, Bohumil, *Umělecké památky Moravy a Slezska*, 3 vols. (Prague, 1994–99).

Samuels, Ernest, *Bernard Berenson: The Making of a Connoisseur* (Cambridge, MA, and London 1979).

——, *Bernard Berenson: The Making of a Legend* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1987).

Sandell, Richard, ed., *Museums, Society, Inequality* (Leicester, 2002).

Sandler, Irving, *The Triumph of American Painting: A History of Abstract Expressionism* (New York and San Francisco, 1976).

Sarapik, Virve, 'Estonian Art of the 1990s and the Postsemiotic Turn', in *Noisy Nineties: Problems, Themes and Meanings in Estonian Art on 1990s*, ed. Sirje Helme and Johannes Saar (Tallinn, 2001) 279–313.

Sarapik, Virve, Kadri Tüür, and Mari Laanemets, eds., *Koht ja paik: Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics* (Tallinn, 2000–2008).

Sass, Else Kai, 'Kunsthistorie', *Københavns Universitet 1479–1979* XI, ed. Povl Johannes Jensen (Copenhagen, 1979) 246–63.

Sauerländer, Willibald, 'From Stilus to Style: Reflections on the Fate of a Notion', *Art History* 6.3 (1983) 253–70.

Savile, Anthony, *The Test of Time: An Essay in Philosophical Aesthetics* (Oxford, 1982).

Savoy, Bénédicte, ed., *Tempel der Kunst: Die Entstehung des öffentlichen Museums in Deut-schland 1701–1815* (Mainz, 2006).

Sayer, Derek, *The Coasts of Bohemia: A Czech History* (Princeton, NJ, 1998).

Sbrilli, Antonella, *Storia dell'arte in codice binario: La riproduzione digitale delle opere arti-stiche* (Milano, 2001).

Scaltsa, Matoula and Dimitra Tsouhlou, eds., *Ethouses tehnis stin Ellada*, ed. Matoula Scaltsa (Athens, 1989).

Scaltsa, Matoula, *Gounaropoulos* (Athens, 1990).

Schaeffer, Jean-Marie, *Art of the Modern Age: Philosophy of Art from Kant to Heidegger*, trans. Steven Rendall (Princeton, NJ, 2000).

Schapiro, Meyer, 'Style', in *Anthropology Today*, ed. Alfred L. Kroeber (Chicago, IL, 1953) 287–312.

——, *Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist and Society* (New York, 1994).

Schefer, Jean-Louis, *Questions de style* (Paris, 1995).

——, *Du monde et du mouvement des images* (Paris, 1998).

Scheidemann, Christian, 'Authenticity: How to get there?' in *Art Conservation and Authentici-ties: Material, Concept, Context*, ed. Erma Hermens and Tina Fiske (London, 2009) 3–12.

von Schlosser Julius, *Die Kunstliteratur: Ein Handbuch zur Quellenkunde der neueren Kunst-geschichte* (Vienna, 1924).

——, *Tote Blicke: Geschichte der Porträtbildnerei in Wachs*, ed. Thomas Medicus (Berlin, 1993).

Schmidt, Sarah, 'Künstlerische Forschung', *kritische berichte: Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kul-turwissenschaften* 35.3 (2007) 50–3.

Schmidt-Burkhardt, Astrit, *Stammbäume der Kunst: Zur Genealogie der Avantgarde* (Berlin, 2005).

Schmidt-Degener, Frederik, Eric MacLagan, Francisco Javier Sanchez Canton, and Eurip-ides Foundoukidis, eds., *Muséographie: Architecture et aménagement des musées d'art. Conférence internationale d'études, Madrid 1934* (Paris, 1935).

Schneemann, Peter J., 'Nähe und Distanz als Herausforderung einer Kunstgeschichte der Gegenwart: Fragen zum Konzept einer erweiterten Dokumentation', in *Visions of a Future: Art and Art History in Changing Contexts*' ed. Hans-Jörg Heusser and Kornelia Imesch (Zürich, 2004) 293–306.

——, 'Eigennutz: Das Interesse von Künstlern am Werkkatalog', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte* 62 (2005) 217–24.

——, 'Ich bin keine Zielgruppe: Zur Konstellation von Produktions- und Rezeptionstypologien in der Gegenwart', in *Grammatik der Kunstgeschichte: Sprachproblem und Regelwerk im "Bild-Diskurs": Festzeitschrift für Oskar Bätschmann*, ed. Hubert Locher and Peter J. Schneemann (Zürich, 2008) 78–91.

Schneider, Pablo, 'Begriffliches Denken—verkörpertes Sehen: Edgar Wind (1900–1971)' in *Ideengeschichte der Bildwissenschaft: Siebzehn Porträt*s, ed. Jörg Probst and Jost Philipp Klenner (Frankfurt am Main, 2009) 53–74.

Schoell-Glass, Charlotte, 'Zeitschriften', in *Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft: Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe*, ed. Ulrich Pfisterer (Stuttgart and Weimar, 2003) 395–400.

Schoell-Glass, Charlotte and Elizabeth Sears, *Verzetteln als Methode: Der humanistische Ikonologe William S. Heckscher (1904–1999); Hamburger Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte* 6 (Berlin, 2008).

Schröder-Esch, Sebastian, ed., *Practical Aspects of Cultural Heritage: Presentation, Revaluation, Development* (Weimar, 2006).

Schröder-Esch, Sebastian and Justus H. Ulbricht, eds., *The Politics of Heritage and Regional Development: Actors, Interests, Conflicts* (Weimar, 2006).

Schroeder-Gudehus, Brigitte, ed., *La société industrielle et ses musées: Demande sociale et choix politiques, 1890–1990* (Paris, 1992).

Schulz, Martin, *Ordnungen der Bilder: Eine Einführung in die Bildwissenschaft* (Munich, 2009).

Schumacher, Rogier, *Museumjournaal en de ontvangst van de neo-avant-garde in Nederland 1961–1973* (Dissertation Universiteit Utrecht, 2007).

Schupbach, William, 'Some Cabinets of Curiosities in European Academic Institutions', in *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth Century Europe*, ed. Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor (Oxford, 1985) 169–78.

Schwarz, Michael Viktor, ed., *Wiener Schule: Erinnerung und Perspektiven*, *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 53 (Vienna, Cologne and Weimar, 2004).

Schwarzer, Mitchell, 'Origins of the Art History Survey Text', *Art Journal* 3 (1995) 24–9.

Sciolla, Gianni Carlo, *La critica d'arte del Novecento* (Turin, 1995).

——, *Studiare l'arte: Metodo, analisi e interpretazione delle opere e degli artisti* (Turin, 2006).

——, 'J.J. Tikkanen and the Origins of "Kunstwissenschaft" in Italy', in *Towards a Science of Art History: J.J. Tikkanen and Art Historical Scholarship in Europe*, ed. Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2009) 95–102.

Scitovsky, Tibor, 'What's Wrong with the Arts is What's Wrong with Society', *American Economic Review* 62 (1972) 62–9.

Secrest, Meryle, *Duveen: A Life in Art* (New York, 2005).

Sedlmayr, Hans, *Verlust der Mitte: Die bildende Kunst des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts als Symbol der Zeit* (Salzburg, 1948).

Semper, Gottfried, *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts: or, Practical Aesthetics* (1860), trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Michael Robinson (Santa Monica, CA, 2004).

Serota, Nicholas, *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art* (London, 2000).

Settis, Salvatore, 'Iconografia dell'arte italiana, 1100–1500: una linea' in *Storia dell'arte italiana* I.3, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin 1979) 175–270.

——, ed., *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*, 3 vols. (Turin, 1984–86).

Shattuck, Kathryn, 'John Montias, 76, Scholar of Economics and of Art', *The New York Times*, 1 August 2005, 13.

Sheehan, James J., *Museums in the German Art World: From the End of the Old Regime to the Rise of Modernism* (New York, 2000).

Siliņš, Jānis, *Latvijas māksla 1800–1914*, 2 vols. (Stockholm, 1979–80).

——, *Latvijas māksla 1915–1940*, 3 vols. (Stockholm, 1988–93).

Simonton, Dean, *Genius and Creativity: Selected Papers* (New York, 1997).

Singerman, Howard, *Art Subjects: Making Artists in the American University* (Berkeley, CA, 1999).

——, 'Sherrie Levine's Art History', *October* 101 (2002) 96–121.

Sirén, Osvald, *Histoire des arts anciens de la Chine* (Paris, 1929–30).

——, *The Gardens of China* (New York, 1949).

Skórczewski, Dariusz, 'Wobec eurocentryzmu, dekolonizacji i postmodernizmu: O niektórych problemach teorii postkolonialnej i jej polskich perspektywach', *Teksty Drugie* 1.2 (2008) 33–56.

Skubiszewski, Piotr, 'Miejsce Jana Białostockiego w polskiej historii sztuki', in *Ars longa: Prace dedykowane pamięci profesora Jana Białostockiego*, ed. Maria Poprzęcka (Warsaw, 1999) 11–21.

Smiers, Joost, *Arts under Pressure: Promoting Cultural Diversity in the Age of Globalization.* (London and New York, 2003).

Smith, Laurajane, *Uses of Heritage* (London, 2006).

——, 'Heritage, Gender and Identity', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, ed. Brian Graham and Peter Howard (Aldershot, 2008) 159–78.

Smith, Terry, 'Contemporary Art and Contemporaneity', *Critical Inquiry* 32 (2006) 681–707.

——, 'Writing the History of Contemporary Art: A Distinction, Three Propositions and Six Lines of Inquiry', in *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, ed. Jaynie Anderson (Melbourne, 2009) 918–21.

——, 'The State of Art History: Contemporary Art', *Art Bulletin* 92.3 (2010) 366–83.

Snowman, Daniel, *The Hitler Emigrés: The Cultural Impact on Britain of Refugees from Nazism* (London, 2002).

Soane, John, 'The Renaissance of Cultural Vernacularism in Germany', in *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*, ed. Gregory J. Ashworth and Peter J. Larkham (London, 1994) 159–77.

Sohm, Philip, 'Ordering History with Style: Giorgio Vasari on the Art of History', in *Antiquity and its Interpreters*, ed. Alina Payne, Ann Kuttner, and Rebekah Smick (Cambridge, 2000) 40–55.

——, *Style in the Art Theory of Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge, 2001).

Sokół, Lech, ed., *Instytut Sztuki Polskiej Akademii Nauk 1949–1999* (Warsaw, 2000).

Šola, Tomislav, *Essays on Museums and their Theory: Toward the Cybernetic Museum* (Helsinki, 1997).

Solomõkova, Irina, *Eesti kunsti ajalugu kahes köites* (Tallinn, 1975).

——, *Hando Mugasto* (1907–1937) (Tallinn, 1984).

Somaini, Antonio, ed., *Il luogo dello spettatore: Forme dello sguardo nella cultura delle immagini* (Milan, 2005).

Sor, Peter and Sándor Radnóti, eds., *Stilepoche: Theorie und Diskussion* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990).

Soto, Jesus R., 'The Role of Scientific Concepts in Art', *Leonardo, Art and Science: Similarities, Differences and Interactions*, special issue 27 (1994) 227–30.

Soutif, Daniel, *Papiers Journal: Chroniques d'art (1981–1993)* (Nîmes, 1993).

——, ed., *L'art du XXᵉ siècle, 1939–2002: De l'art moderne à l'art contemporain* (Paris, 2005).

Spanjaard, Helena, *Het ideaal van een moderne Indonesische schilderkunst 1900–1995: De creatie van een nationale culturele identiteit* (Unpublished Dissertation, University of Leiden, 1998).

Sricchia Santoro, Fiorella, 'Arte italiana e arte straniera', in *Storia dell'arte italiana* I.3, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin 1979) 71–171.

Srimani, Shyama Charan, *Suksha Shilper Utpatti o Arya Jatir Shilpa Chaturi* ('Fine Arts of India, With a Short Sketch of the Origins of Art') (Calcutta, 1874).

Stafford, Barbara Maria, *Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine* (Cambridge, MA, 1993).

——, *Artful Science: Enlightenment Entertainment and the Eclipse of Visual Education* (Cambridge, MA, 1996).

Stainova, Mikhaila, *Османско изкуство на Балканите: XV–XVIII век.* (Sofia, 1995).

Stange, Alfred, *Deutsche Malerei der Gotik*, 11 vols. (Berlin, 1934–61).

Starn, Randolph, 'Three Ages of "Patina" in Painting', *Representations* 78 (2002) 86–115.

Stecker, Robert, *Artworks: Definition, Meaning, Value* (University Park, PA, 1997).

Ştefănescu, Ioan D., *L'Évolution de la Peinture religieuse en Bucovine et en Moldavie depuis les origines jusqu'au XIXᵉ siècle* (Paris, 1928).

Stefanov, Svilen, *Българският печат от 20-те години* (Sofia, 1994).

——, 'Динамика на художествените модели в съвременното българско изкуство', *Проблеми на изкуството* 1 (1998) 3–8.

——, *Авангард и Норма: Иновационни тенденции в българското изкуство от края на XX век* (Sofia, 2003).

Stejskal, Karel, *Karl IV. und die Kultur und Kunst seiner Zeit* (Prague, 1978).

von Steuben, Hans, 'Der Doryphoros und der Kanon Polyklets', *Städel-Jahrbuch* 15 (1996) 7–18.

Stevović, Ivan, *Kalenić: Bogorodičina crkva u arhitekturi poznovizantijskog sveta* (Belgrade, 2006).

Stiennon, Jacques and Rita Lejeune, *Rhin-Meuse: Art et Civilisation 800–1400* (Brussels, 1972).

Stigler, George and Gary Becker, 'De gustibus non est disputandum', *American Economic Review* 67 (1977) 76–90.

Stoichiţă, Victor, 'Un essai d'analyse psycholinguistique des origines de l'art abstrait: Kandinsky et Mondrian', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire de l'Art* 13 (1976) 31–54.

——, *Mondrian* (Bucharest, 1979).

——, *Efectul Don Quijote: Repere pentru o hermeneutică a imaginarului european* (Bucharest, 1995).

——, *Image picturale et expérience visionnaire dans l'Espagne du 'Siècle d'Or'* (Paris, 1995).

Stoikov, Atanas, *Критика на абстрактното изкуство и неговите теории* (Sofia, 1963).

——, *След заника на абстракционизма* (Sofia, 1970).

——, *Изкуството на САЩ* (Sofia, 1983).

Stokes, Simon, *Art and Copyright* (Oxford, 2003).

Stolić, Ana and Nenad Makuljević, eds., *Privatni život kod Srba u devetnaestom veku* (Belgrade, 2006).

Storr, Robert, *Modern Art despite Modernism* (New York, 2002).

Strzygowski, Josef, *Kleinasien: Ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1903).

Sturken, Marita and Lisa Cartwright, *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture* (Oxford, 2001).

Subotić, Gojko, *Ohridska slikarska škola XV veka* (Belgrade, 1980).

——, *The Sacred Land: Art of Kosovo* (New York, 1998).

Subotić, Irina, *Likovni krug časopisa 'Zenit' (1921–1926)* (PhD Dissertation, University of Ljubljana, 1990).

——, *Likovni krug revije 'Zenit': 1921–1926* (Ljubljana, 1995).

Summers, David, 'Form: Nineteenth-Century Metaphysics, and the Problem of Art Historical Description', *Critical Inquiry* 15.2 (1989) 372–406.

——, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism* (London, 2003).

Švácha, Rostislav, ed., *Kapitoly z českých dějin umění* (Prague, 1986).

Švácha, Rostislav and Marie Platovská, eds., *Dějiny Českého Výtvarného Umění, 1958–2000* (Prague, 2007).

Szeemann, Harald, *Ecrire les expositions* (Brussels, 1996).

Tamvaki, Angela, ed., *From El Greco to Cézanne: Masterpieces of European Painting from the National Gallery of Art, Washington and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York* (Athens, 1992).

Tanner, Jeremy, ed., *The Sociology of Art: A Reader* (London, 2003).

Theodorescu, Răzvan, *Bizanţ, Balcani, Occident* (Bucharest, 1974).

——, *Civilizaţia românilor între medieval şi modern* (Bucharest, 1987).

——, 'Istoria civilizaţiei vechi a românilor şi Iorga precursorul', *Memoriile secţiei de ştiinţe istorice şi arheologie a Academiei Române* 20 (1995) 59–62.

Therrien, Lyne, *L'histoire de l'art en France: Genèse d'une discipline universitaire* (Paris, 1998).

Thompson, Daniel V., trans., *The Craftsman's Handbook: Il Libro dell' Arte by Cennino d'Andrea. Cennini* (New Haven, CT, 1933).

Thomsen, Christian Jürgensen, *Ledetraad til Nordisk Oldkyndighed* (Copenhagen, 1836).

Throsby, David, 'The Production and Consumption of the Arts: A View of Cultural Economics', *Journal of Economic Literature* 23 (1994) 1–29.

Thuillier, Jacques, *Théorie générale de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris, 2003).

Tickner, Lisa, *Hornsey 1968: The Art School Revolution* (London, 2008).

Tikkanen, Johan, *Der malerische Styl Giotto's: Versuch zu einer Charakteristik desselben* (Helsinki, 1884).

——, *Die Psalterillustration im Mittelalter* (Helsinki, 1895–1900).

Till, Karen, *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place* (Minneapolis, MN, 2005).

Timotijević, Miroslav, *Teodor Ilić Češljar (1746–1793)* (Novi Sad, 1989).

——, *Srpsko barokno slikarstvo* (Novi Sad, 1996).

——, *Radjanje moderne privatnosti: privatni život Srba u Habzburškoj monarhiji od kraja 17. do početka 19. veka* (Belgrade, 2006).

Tornjov, Anton, 'Постройката на духовната академия', *БИАД* 18 (1923) 302–3.

Todić, Branislav, 'Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti', in *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta: 150 godina Filozofskog fakulteta*, ed. Milan Popović (Belgrade, 1990) 355–66.

——, *Serbian Medieval Painting: The Age of King Milutin* (Belgrade, 1999).

Todić, Milanka, *Istorija srpske fotografije (1839–1940)* (Belgrade, 1993).

Tóibín, Colm, 'A Godsend to Every Crank in Ireland—on the Left or on the Right', *Guardian*, 14 June 2008, 5.

Tommasi, Anna Chiara, ed., *Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle conoscitore e conservatore* (Venice, 1998).

Törmä, Minna, 'Decade of Change: 1920's in the Life of Osvald Sirén', in *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, eds. Renja Suominen-Kokkonen and Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2007) 157–68.

Towse, Ruth, ed., *A Handbook of Cultural Economics* (Cheltenham, 2003).

Treier, Heie, *Pärsimägi: Võrumaa—Tartu—Paris* (Tallinn, 2003).

Trifunović, Lazar, *Srpsko slikarstvo 1900–1950* (Belgrade, 1973).

Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti, *Birinci Türk Tarihi Kongresi Konferanslar-Müzakere Zabitları* (Ankara 1932).

Turkle, Sherry, ed., *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With* (Cambridge, MA, 2007).

Tzigara-Samurcaş, Alexandru, *Arta în România I: Studii critice* (Bucharest, 1909).

——, *Muzeografie românească* (Bucharest, 1936).

Ugren, Dragomir, ed., *Evropski konteksti umetnosti XX veka u Vojvodini* (Novi Sad, 2008).

Ullmann, Stephen, *Style in the French Novel* (Cambridge, 1957).

Ulrich, Eugen, 'The Notion and Definition of the Canon', in *The Canon Debate: On the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, MA, 2002) 21–35.

Umbrasas, Jonas and Eglė Kunčiuvienė, *Lietuvių dailininkų organizacijos 1900–1940* (Vilnius, 1980).

Umbrasas, Jonas, *Lietuvių tapybos raida 1900–1940: srovės ir tendencijos* (Vilnius, 1987).

University of Helsinki, *Research Assessment Exercise 2005, Evaluation Report* (Helsinki, 2005).

Üprus, Helmi, *Päikesemängud* (Tallinn, 1976).

Ursprung, Philip, 'Performative Kunstgeschichte', in *Kunstgeschichte & Gegenwartskunst: Vom Nutzen & Nachteil der Zeitgenossenschaft*, ed. Verena Krieger (Cologne, 2007) 213–26.

Utter, Õie, 'Reinhold von Lipharti annetatud kunsitkogu üleandmisne Tartu Ülikoolile', *Tartu Ülikooli ajaloo küsimusi VII* (Tartu, 1979) 126–33.

Vaga, Alfred, *Eesti Kunsti Ajalugu* (Tallinn, 1932).

Vaga, Voldemar, *Eesti kunst: Kunstide ajalugu Eestis keskajast meie päevini* (Tartu, 1940–1).

——, *Kunst Tallinnas XIX sajandil* (Tallinn, 1971).

——, *Kunst Tartus XIX sajandil* (Tallinn, 1971).

Vaihinger, Hans, *Die Philosophie des als ob* (Leipzig, 1927).

Vaišvilaitė, Irena, *Baroko pradžia Lietuvoje*, Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis/Vilniaus dailės akademijos darbai. Dailė 6 (Vilnius, 1995).

Vakkari, Johanna, *Focus on Form: J.J. Tikkanen, Giotto and Art Research in the 19th Century* (Helsinki, 2007).

——, 'J.J. Tikkanen and the Teaching of Art History', in *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, eds. Renja Suominen-Kokkonen and Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2007) 69–83.

Van Binnendijk, Chandra and Paul Faber, *Beeldende kunst in Suriname: De twintigste eeuw* (Amsterdam, 2000).

Van der Stighelen, Kathleen, *A chacun sa grâce: Femmes artistes en Belgique et au Pays-Bas: 1500–1950* (Ghent, 1999).

Van de Wetering, Ernst and Paul Broekhof, 'New directions in the Rembrandt Research project, Part I: the 1642 self-portrait in the Royal Collection', *The Burlington Magazine* 138 (March 1996) 174–80.

Van de Wetering, Ernst, 'Connoisseurship and Rembrandt's Paintings: New Directions in the Rembrandt Research Project II', *The Burlington Magazine* 150 (February 2008) 83–90.

Van Kalck, Michele, ed., *Les Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique: Deux siècles d'histoire* (Brussels, 2003).

Van Rheeden, Herbert, *Om de vorm: Een eeuw teken-, handenarbeid- en kunstnijverheidsonderwijs in Nederland* (Unpublished Dissertation, University of Amsterdam, 1988).

Vasari, Giorgio, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, ed. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi, 4 vols. (Florence, 1966–87).

——, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, trans. Gaston du C. de Vere, 2 vols. (New York, 1996).

Vasilchina, Violeta, 'Приложното изкуство между "български стил", сецесиона и "родното" ', *Из историята на българското изобразително изкуство* 3 (Sofia, 1992) 90–108.

Vasiliev, Asen, *Български възрожденски майстори: Живописци, резбари, строители* (Sofia, 1965).

——, ed., *Каменна пластика* (Sofia, 1973).

Venturi, Adolfo, 'Per la storia dell'arte', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 4 (1887) 229–50.

——, *Storia dell'arte italiana*, 25 vols. (Milan, 1901–40).

——, Ettore Pais, and Pompeo Molmenti, *Monumental Dalmatia* (Milan, 1917).

Venturi, Lionello, *History of Art Criticism* trans. Charles Marriott (New York, 1936).

——, *Paul Cézanne: Son art, son œuvre* (Paris, 1936).

——, *Les archives de l'Impressionnisme* (Paris, 1939).

——, *Pissarro: Son art, son oeuvre* (Paris, 1939).

——, *La mia prospettiva estetica*, ed. Luigi Stefanini (Brescia, 1953).

Vergo, Peter, ed., *The New Museology* (London, 1989).

Vermazen, Bruce, 'Comparing Evaluations of Works of Art', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 34 (1975) 7–14.

Veselý, Dalibor, *Architecture in the Age of Divided Representation: The Question of Creativity in the Shadow of Production* (Cambridge, MA, 2004).

Viljo, Eva Maijo, 'Carl Gustav Estlander and the Beginning of Studies of the Visual Arts at the University of Helsinki', in *The Shaping of Art History in Finland*, eds. Renja Suominen-Kokkonen and Johanna Vakkari (Helsinki, 2007) 25–39.

Viollet-le-Duc, Eugène, *Lectures on Architecture*, trans. Benjamin Bucknell, 2 vols. (New York, 1877–81).

Vipers, Boriss, *Latvju māksla* (Riga, 1927).

——, *Džoto* (Riga, 1938).

——, *Jāzeps Grosvalds* (Riga, 1938).

——, *Baroque Art in Latvia* (Riga, 1939).

——, *L'art Letton: Essai de synthese historique* (Riga, 1940).

——, *Mākslas likteņi un vērtības* (Riga, 1940).

Virilio, Paul, *War and Cinema: The Logistics of Perception*, trans. Patrick Camiller (London, 2009).

Vlahos, Manolis, *O zografos Konstantinos Volanakis, 1837–1907* (PhD Dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1974).

Vlahuţă, Alexandru, *Pictorul N.I. Grigorescu*: *Viaţa şi opera lui* (Bucharest, 1910).

Vlasiu, Ioana, 'Modernităţile picturii româneşti interbelice', in *Culorile avangardei: Arta în România 1910–1950, ed. Erwin Kessler* (Bucharest, 2007) 35–61.

Vlček, Pavel, Růžena Baťková, and Dalibor Prix, eds., *Umělecké památky Prahy*, 4 vols. (Prague, 1996–2000).

Vojvodić, Dragan, *Idejne osnove srpske vladarske slike u srednjem veku* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Belgrade University, 2006).

Volkenandt, Klaus, ed., *Kunstgeschichte und Weltgegenwartskunst: Konzepte, Methoden, Perspektiven* (Berlin, 2004).

Vorobjovas, Mikalojus, *Vilniaus menas* (Kaunas, 1940; reprint 1997).

Waetzoldt, Wilhelm, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1921 and 1924).

——, 'Seduta plenaria', *Atti del X Congresso internazionale di storia dell'arte, Roma 1912* (Rome, 1922) 17–42.

Wallach, Alan, 'Meyer Schapiro's Essay on Style: Falling into the Void', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55.1 (1997) 11–15.

Walton, Kendall L., 'Style and the Products and Processes of Art', in *The Concept of Style*, ed. Berel Lang (Philadelphia, PA, 1979) 45–66.

Waltrovits, Mihailo, *Građa za istoriju umetnosti Srbije* (Belgrade, 1874).

——, *Ο Πρόδρομος: Mittheilungen über neue Forschungen auf dem Gebiete serbischer Kirchenbaukunst* (Vienna, 1878).

——, *Pogled na staru srpsku crkvenu arhitekturu* (Belgrade, 1889).

Warburg, Aby, 'Heidnisch-antike Weissagung in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten', in Warburg, *Ausgewählte Schriften und Würdigungen*, ed. Dieter Wuttke (Baden Baden, 3rd edn., 1992) 199–304.

——, *Die Erneuerung der heidnischen Antike: Kulturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der europäischen Renaissance*, ed. Horst Bredekamp and Michael Diers (Berlin, 1998) (First published 1932).

——, *Der Bilderatlas Mnemosyne*, ed. Martin Warnke and Claudia Brink (Berlin, 1999).

——, 'Pagan-Antique Prophecy in Words and Images in the Age of Luther', in Warburg, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity*, trans. David Britt (Los Angeles, 1999) 597–697.

Warnke, Martin, ed., *Das Kunstwerk zwischen Wissenschaft und Weltanschauung* (Gütersloh, 1970).

——, 'Schlagbilder und Bilderfahrzeuge', in *Die Menschenrechte des Auges: Über Aby Warburg*, ed. Werner Hofmann, Georg Syamken, and Martin Warnke (Frankfurt am Main, 1980) 75–83.

——, *The Court Artist: On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist*, 1985, trans. David McLintock (Cambridge, 1993).

Waschek, Matthias, ed., *Relire Focillon* (Paris, 1998).

Wassal, Gregory and Neil Alper, 'Toward A Unified Theory of the Determinants of the Earnings of Artists', in *Cultural Economics*, ed. Ruth Towse and Abdul Kakhee (Heidelberg, 1992) 187–200.

Watelet, Claude-Henri and Pierre-Charles Levesque, *Dictionnaire des arts de peinture, sculpture et gravure* (Paris, 1792).

Waterfield, Giles, ed., *Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain 1790–1990* (London, 1991).

Weber, Gregor J.M., 'Die Galerie als Kunstwerk: Die Hängung italienischer Gemälde in der Dresdner Galerie 1754', in *Elbflorenz: Italienische Präsenz in Dresden 16.–19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Barbara Marx (Amsterdam, 2000) 219–42.

Weber, Raymond, ed., *Forward Planning: The Function of Cultural Heritage in a Changing Europe* (Strasbourg, 2005).

Weddigen, Tristan, 'Ein Modell für die Geschichte der Kunst: Die Hängungen der Dresdener Gemäldegalerie zwischen 1747 und 1856', *Dresdener Kunstblätter* 53.1 (2009) 44–58.

Weibel, Peter and Andrea Buddensieg, eds., *Contemporary Art and the Museum: A Global Perspective* (Ostfildern, 2007).

Weissert, Caecilie, *Stil in der Kunstgeschichte: Neue Wege der Forschung* (Darmstadt, 2009).

Welchman, John C., ed., *Institutional Critique and After* (Zürich, 2006).

Wendland, Ulrike, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1999).

Werckmeister, Otto Karl, 'The Turn from Marx to Warburg in West German Art History 1968–1990', in *Marxism and the History of Art: From William Morris to the New Left*, ed. Andrew Hemmingway (London, 2006) 213–20.

Werner, Paul, *Museum, Inc.: Inside the global Art World* (Chicago, IL, 2005).

Westphal, Merold, 'The Canon as Flexible, Normative Fact', *The Monist* 76 (1993) 436–49.

White, Harrison and Cynthia, *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World* (Chicago, IL, 1965).

Whiting, Cécile, *Pop L.A.: Art and the City in the 1960s* (Berkeley, CA, 2006).

Wimpfeling, Jakob, *Epitome rerum Germanicarum* (1505), (Marburg, 1562).

Winckelmann, Johann Joachim, *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture*, trans. Elfriede Heyer and Roger C. Norton (La Salle, IL, 1987).

——, *History of the Art of Antiquity* (1764), trans. Alex Potts and Harry Francis Mallgrave (Los Angeles, 2006).

Wind, Edgar, 'Warburg's Concept of Kulturwissenschaft and its Meaning for Aesthetics (1931)', in Wind, *The Eloquence of Symbols: Studies in Humanist Art* ed. Jaynie Anderson (Oxford, 1983) 21–36.

——, *Das Experiment und die Metaphysik: Zur Auflösung der kosmologischen Antinomien*, ed. Bernhard Buschendorf (Frankfurt am Main, 2000).

Winkelmann, Jan, 'Intuitive Formalismen', in *Kunst und Text, Heimo Zobernig*, ed. Annelie Pohlen and Heimo Zobernig (Leipzig, 1998) 31–36.

Wintour, Patrick, 'In Liverpool's Footsteps: Now Every City Can Aim to Be Britain's Capital of Culture', *Guardian*, 7 January 2009, 11.

Wirth, Zdeněk, ed., *Československá vlastivěda* 6. (Prague, 1935).

Wittlin, Alma S., *The Museum: Its History and its Tasks in Education* (London, 1949).

——, *Museums: In Search of a Usable Future* (Cambridge, MA, 1970).

Wocel, Johann E., *Grundzüge der böhmischen Altertumskunde* (Prague, 1845).

Woermann, Karl, *Die Kunst aller Zeiten und Völker*, 6 vols. (Leipzig, 1900–11).

Wolff, Janet, *The Social Production of Art* (London, 1981).

Wölfflin, Heinrich, *Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art* (1915), trans. Marie Donald Mackie Hottinger (New York, 1932).

——, *Podstawowe pojęcia historii sztuki: Problem rozwoju stylu w sztuce nowożytnej*, transl. Danuta Hanulanka (Wrocław, 1962).

Wollheim, Richard, 'Pictorial Style: Two Views', in *The Concept of Style*, ed. Berel Lang (Philadelphia, PA, 1979) 129–45.

——, *Painting as an Art* (London, 1987) 25–36.

——, 'Style in Painting', in *The Question of Style in Philosophy and the Arts*, ed. Caroline van Eck, James McAllister, and Renée van de Vall (Cambridge, 1995) 37–49.

Woltmann, Alfred, *Deutsche Kunst in Prag* (Leipzig, 1877).

Woodson-Boulton, Amy, ' "Industry without Art Is Brutality": Aesthetic Ideology and Social Practice in Victorian Art Museums', *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007) 47–71.

Worobiow, Nikolai, *M.K. Čiurlionis: Litauischer Maler und Musiker* (Kaunas and Leipzig, 1938).

Wulffen, Thomas, 'Betriebssystem Kunst—Eine Retrospektive', *Kunstforum International* 125 (1994) 50–8.

Wunenburger, Jean-Jacques, *L'imaginaire* (Paris, 2003).

Wyss, Beat and Anne-Marie Bonnet, 'Statements zur Gegenwart und Zukunft der Kunstgeschichte', *Kunsthistorische Arbeitsblätter: Zeitschrift für Studium und Hochschulkontakt* 7/8 (2004) I, 81–8 and 9 (2004) II, 55–60.

Xydis, Alexandros, 'Pros ti defteri dekaetia tou Makedonikou Kentrou Sinhronis Tehnis', in *Macedonian Centre for Contemporary Art*, ed. Matoula Scaltsa (Thessaloniki, 1992) 15–17.

Zangwill, Nick, 'In Defence of Moderate Aesthetic Formalism', *The Philosophical Quarterly* 50.201, (2000) 476–93.

——, 'In Defence of Extreme Formalism About Inorganic Nature', *British Journal of Aesthetics* 45.2 (2005) 185–91.

Zeri, Federico, *J'avoue m'être trompé: fragments d'une autobiographie* (Paris, 1995).

——, *Pittura e Controriforma: L'arte senza tempo di Scipione da Gaeta* (Turin, 1957).

Zerner, Henri, 'L'art', in *Faire de l'histoire*, 2: *Nouvelles approches*, ed. Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora (Paris, 1974) 183–202.

——, *Ecrire l'histoire de l'art: Figures d'une discipline* (Paris, 1997).

Zgórniak, Marek, ' "Dziełocentryzm" wobec faktów: O kilku interpretacjach obrazów Rodakowskiego i Mehoffera', *Folia Historiae Artium* 10 (2005) 161–71.

Zias, Nicos, *I kosmiki zografiki tou Foti Kontoglou* (PhD Dissertation, University of Athens, 1985).

Zijlmans, Kitty and Wilfried van Damme, eds., *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches* (Amsterdam, 2008).

Zimmermann, Michael F., ed., *The Art Historian: National Traditions and Institutional Practices* (London and New Haven, CT, 2003).

Zlat, Mieczysław, 'O twórczości i poglądach Władysława Podlachy (1875–1951)', in *Myśl o sztuce*, ed. Teresa Hrankowska (Warsaw, 1976) 295–311.

Zobel, Rein, *Tallinna keskaegsed kindlustused* (Tallinn, 1980).

Zobernig, Heimo, *Heimo Zobernig: Austelung Katerlog* (Cologne, 2003).

Zolberg, Vera, *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts* (Cambridge, 1990).

Zolberg, Vera and Joni Cherbo, eds., *Outsider Art: Contesting Boundaries in Contemporary Culture* (Cambridge, 1997).

Zuschlag, Christoph, *'Entartete Kunst': Ausstellungsstrategien im Nazi-Deutschland* (Worms, 1995).

INDEX